#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

MEETING

U.S. COMMISSION CT 4./A 分學報\$

Friday, October 13, 2006

The meeting was held in Room 540 of 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

7 9

GERALD A. REYNOLDS CHAIRMAN

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR COMMISSIONER

ARLAN D. MELENDEZ COMMISSIONER

MICHAEL YAKI COMMISSIONER

PETER KIRSANOW COMMISSIONER

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS COMMISSIONER

STAFF PRESENT:

KENNETH L. MARCUS STAFF DIRECTOR

DEREK HORNE, ESQ. OFFICE OF THE STAFF DIRECTOR

DAVID BLACKWOOD, ESQ. OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

#### STAFF PRESENT (Continued):

MARGARET BUTLER OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

EVALUATION

MANUEL ALBA PUBLIC AFFAIRS UNIT

TINA LOUISE MARTIN OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT

TYRO BEATTY HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION

PAMELA DUNSTON ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND

· CLEARINGHOUSE DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES, ESQ OFFICE OF THE STAFF DIRECTOR

RICHARD SCHMECEL

KIMBERLY SCHULDZ

SOCK-FOON MAC DOUGALL

BERNARD QUARTERMAN

MICHELE YORKMAN RAMEY

## CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda	. 4
II.	Approval of Minutes of August 18 Meeting	. 5
III.	Staff Director's Report	. 6
IV.	Program Planning	. 12
v.	State Advisory Committee Issues	. 44
VI.	Briefing on Voter Fraud and Voter	
	Intimidation	108
	Dr. Robert Pastor	114
	Thor Hearne	121
	Donna Brazile	130
	John Fund	138
Adjour	rn	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(9:10 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. This meeting
4	will come to order.
5	This is a meeting of the U.S. Commission
6	on Civil Rights at 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Room 540,
7	Washington, D.C.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Zip code?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No zip code.
10	With the exception of the Vice Chair,
11	Abigail Thernstrom, all Commissioners are present.
12	I. Approval of Agenda
13	The first item on the agenda is the
14	approval of the agenda. I would like to move to amend
15	the agenda under Program Planning. I'd like to delete
16	"Research on Academic Mismatch." That's not ready,
17	and the same would be true for "Procedures for
18	National Office Work Products." That's not ready.
19	So with that amendment is there a second?
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
22	(No response.)
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor say aye.
24	(Chorus of ayes.)
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any abstentions?

1	Dissents?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion carries.
4	II. Approval of Minutes of August 18 Meeting
5	Okay. The second item on the agenda is
6	the approval of the minutes of the August 18, 2006
7	meeting. May I have a motion approving the minutes?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
10	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor say aye.
14	(Chorus of ayes.)
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections?
16	Abstentions?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Question.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The August 18th
20	meeting, was that the meet where all of the votes were
21	voided, a lot of them?
22	MR. MARCUS: That was one of the meetings,
23	yes.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay, and are the
25	minutes being recalibrated to reflect that?

MR. MARCUS: The minutes do reflect that 1 2 on page 4. 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. ٠4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Did we vote? 5 Okay. III. Staff Director's Report 6 Mr. Staff Director, do you have 7 Okay. anything to report? 8 9 MR. MARCUS: Certainly, Mr. Chairman. 10 think there are a few things that I'd like to report 11 on. 12 First, as the Commissioners know, over the 13 last year and a half we've put in place a number of . 14 new procedures and new controls in order to address 15 the significant management and operations problems 16 that had been recognized in numerous audits, including 17 GAO and OPM audits in which we've been talking about 18 over the years. 19 Our hope is not only to remedy the defects 20 that we've had in the agency, but ultimately to serve 21 as a model of excellence in government administration 22 and to provide best practices that can be emulated 23 throughout the government. 24 I don't think that we have reached that 25 yet with respect to all of our management and

23

24

25

operations issues, and we have still quite a number of challenges to deal with, but we do have staff members who are working diligently to try not only to correct past deficiencies, but to provide best practices.

I'm very pleased that our human resources activities have been recognized through best practices within the last month. In particular, Director of Human Resources has put in place a recruitment system to implement the OPMpartners which has been recognized by OPM. They have asked our HR Director to be one of three HR leaders to provide best practices in significant intergovernmental meeting last month. They've also . asked to give other sorts of input from the Commission based on our early experience getting very good results from our application of the career patterns.

I think that we are indebted to our new Director of HR, Tyro Beatty, who has come on board and helped us to provide not just a remedy for weaknesses, but for some early best practices that have already been recognized.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, and would you also talk about the activity, the meeting that was held in Connecticut by the Connecticut SAC?

MR. MARCUS: I'd be pleased to, Mr.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I did have the opportunity to travel to Hartford last month to attend the meeting of the Connecticut State Advisory Committee. This is the first meeting of the newly chartered Connecticut State Advisory Committee, and I think it is one of the most exciting events that we've had in our State Advisory Committee system in quite some time.

The Connecticut SAC had been dormant for a significant period. I spoke with long time members who had never attended a Connecticut SAC event simply because there had not been meetings in the past for resource problems and other issues.

The Connecticut SAC, as you know, was very recently rechartered by this Commission. rechartered only last month, and I am pleased that the event signaled that we have within the State of Connecticut a newly vigorous presence. The meeting was conducted in the State House in Hartford. Ιt featured participation by the Mayor of Hartford, a senior representative of the Office of the Governor, well known government officials at a municipal level, and a wide variety of speakers representing different perspectives, different political perspectives, perspectives from different stakeholders, different

takes on the issue.

The issue was school choice as a civil rights issues. There were members of the panel who are not familiar with the issue, and I think they learned a great deal. There were also members of the panel who were rather expert on the topic, and even they learned a great deal.

The panel itself, I think, worked together in an exemplary fashion. It is a new group composed of both returning members and also new members. It is, I would say, an unusually distinguished group of with a wide variety of individuals.

I was really pleased to meet some of these people who I think are among the leading citizens of the State of Connecticut. They included the pastor of the First Cathedral Baptist Church in Bloomfield, which is one of the largest churches in New England, and certainly one of the largest predominantly minority churches.

One of the leading civil rights litigators in the State of Connecticut, the President of the Connecticut Institute of the Blind, the Shelby Cullen Davis Professor of American Business and Economic Enterprise, a Chairman of the East End Community Council and a veteran of the Bridgeport Police

Department, a legislative analyst for the Connecticut
Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission, the
Director of the Asian American Cultural Center at the
University of Connecticut at Stores, the Indian
Affairs Coordinator with the state's Department of
Environmental Protection, a tenured Professor of
Economics at the University of Connecticut, the
Executive Director of a think tank in Connecticut, and
an environmental attorney who chairs the Hartford
Federalist Society Chapter.

Some of these people had been on the

.4

Some of these people had been on the committee before. Many were new, but I think that the energy and vigor and vitality and cooperation that they had there was very pleasing to see, and I think the members of this Commission would have been pleased if they had had an opportunity to see them.

They were also, I would say, quite grateful to the Commission for providing the resource and the wherewithal to do it. I would commend Ivy Davis, the Eastern Regional Office Director, for her leadership and Barbara Delavis, the staff person who spent so many nights and weekends to put this together.

One other thing that I'd like to briefly mention is that we do not yet have appropriations for

the first Commission meeting of the new fiscal year. The President's budget, I think, recognized some of the advances we've made in management and operations by requesting a modest increase for the agency. The increase was intended to enable us to hire two new attorneys, provide a public service announcement, and to provide some modest funds for state advisory committee travel.

Unfortunately, while both houses of the midst Congress are in of developing appropriations, at this point neither chamber is looking at numbers that provide that increase, and in . fact, both chambers at this point have numbers that in real would be a cut terms, even without consideration a rescission. So in future meetings we'll have to talk about projections.

It could be that some of the things that we were planning to do for this new fiscal year may have to be scaled down, including, for instance, the new attorneys, the public service announcement, some of the expanded SAC travel, and we'll have to revisit that when we have actual numbers.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions?
Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER YAKI: We're under 1 continuing resolution right now, correct? 2 3 MR. MARCUS: That's correct. Program Planning 4 IV. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. 6 Next up we're going to discuss the work for the 7 briefing on the benefits of diversity in K through 12 8 education. May I have a motion that the Commission 9 accept into the record the panelist source materials 10 for the July 28th, 2006 briefing on the benefits of 11 diversity in elementary and secondary education that was distributed to Commissioners on September 1st, 12 13 October 4th, and October 6th? 14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second? 16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? 18 Commissioner Yaki. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Just for the record, 20 did we set a cutoff date for when source materials 21 were supposed to be received? And were all of the 22 source materials that we have that were distributed received by the cutoff date? 23 24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's a question for 25 the Staff Director.

I believe

diversity

There was

but

MR. MARCUS: I'm sorry. 1 Commissioner Yaki is asking about the public comment 2 period for the comments on the K-12 3 briefing; is that correct, Commissioner Yaki? 4 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I am. 5 6 MR. MARCUS: The Commission has not 7 established a public comment period. 8 discussion at a prior meeting about whether there should be a 30-day or, I believe, a 60-day period for 9 10 public comment. As I recall, the Commission adopted 11 the 30-day rather than the 60-day, 12 determined that there were quorum issues so that 13 neither the 30-day nor the 60-day was adopted. 14 There was a prospect of a notational vote 15 to ratify the 30-day period, but at the request of one 16 Commissioner, that notational vote was not taken. 17 we have not established either a 30-day or a 60-day period, which is to say there is no public comment 18 19 period. 20 However, we have accepted any comments 21 that we've gotten from the public, and I can tell you 22 that within the 30-day period from the time of the 23 briefing there were zero comments received. Within 60 24 there were zero comments received.

received, in fact, no public comment. So the question

25

We've

1	whether it should be 60 or 90 days is rather moot.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I wasn't talking about
3	the public comment. I was talking about the source
4	materials themselves. In other words, one of the
5	things for which a record is open is that if the
6	panelist says, "Well, I relied on Wikipedia," you
7	know, whatever it was, and they submit it. That
8	becomes part of the record.
9	If they choose not submit it, I assume
LO	that it goes into the ether and it's not our job to go
L1	and try and pull it together.
L2	So my question is we received two large
L3	packets of information regarding this briefing, and I
L4	would like to know exactly when we received each one
L5	and how many days after the briefing they were
L6	received.
L7	MR. MARCUS: We asked the panelists to
L8	provide their source materials, and we received them
L9	and sent them to the Commissioners fairly shortly
20	after we received them.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So I presume that the
22	large packet we received last week was received some
23	time not too long before that?
24	MR. MARCUS: That's right.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And that information

will be included in the records, the information that 1 was provided to the Commissioners. 2 That's correct. 3 MR. MARCUS: COMMISSIONER YAKI: All source materials? 4 MR. MARCUS: All of the --5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: So anything referred 6 7 to -- I'm puzzled by this because when you say the words "source materials," I just want to know how you 8 9 define that. Do you define that to be anything that a panelist has cited as part of his or her testimony 10 11 material that the panelist has subsequently 12 provided to the Commission no matter what the date 13 that is, and whether or not that was adequately 14 communicated to every single panelist that that, 15 indeed, is the case. 16 MR. MARCUS: I'm referring to all of the 17 materials that were provided by the panelists to the 18 Commission and which were subsequently distributed to 19 all Commissioners. 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: You're avoiding my 21 question. 22 MR. MARCUS: I think I'm answering your 23 question. 24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't think so. 25 question is when we ask -- the way that you define

source materials would, therefore, allow anyone or should allow anyone to submit materials to the Commission for review regardless of the date, regardless of how long after a briefing had been done, outside 30 or 60 days, what have you, because certainly the second batch was received I would say more than 60 days afterwards.

The question I'm asking is I want to know what the policy is because this is the first I'm aware that any source materials by any panelist may be accepted at any time by the Commission for purposes of review, discussion, and what have you, and certainly this is the first time they were ever distributed to Commissioners, whereas in prior meetings I think I made a point that I had never seen some of the stuff that had apparently shown up in one of the reports.

So I'm glad about that, but I'm trying to find out what is the exact policy of the Commission with regard to source materials by a panelist, and it goes to this, which is that if it is an open ended item, I think it behooves us to understand and to know that there should be and can be other opportunities to supplement panelists' testimony with further source materials that perhaps they were unaware of and I was unaware of.

1.9

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, I 1 don't believe that our past practice allows for 2 3 panelists to submit materials indefinitely. 4 think that a panelist would have an opportunity to 5 supplement the record five years after we've published 6 a document. 7 So I think that your question rests on the assumption that there is this indefinite period, or 8 9 are you asking the question is there an indefinite 10 period? 11 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, there appears to 12 be an indefinite period subject to the fact that if 13 something gets published, that somehow becomes the . 14 magical cutoff point, but even then if you were in 15 round one of edits of something and then a panelist 16 says, "Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot that I could have done 17 this, and here are 4,000 more pages of social science 18 research that you should be incorporating into this," 19 blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okav. Ken, do you 21 want to shed some light on what past practices --2.2 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm just saying the 23 reason I'm asking this is that it pertains very much to the further discussion I wish to have on the K 24 25 through 12 briefing and where it goes from here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, is this the 1 2 ' appropriate time to discuss it? Do you want to wait until we -- well, no, let's just get it over with now. 3 Are you suggesting that we should have a 4 policy that has a deadline for when panelists can 5 6 submit their materials? COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that most 7 bodies that take testimony and take information should 8 9 establish a deadline, number one. 10 two, if there's a different Number 11 deadline with regard to public comment 12 panelists, that should be differentiated as well 13 because in the -- this is just my own experience -- in 14 the world that I used to live in, a public comment 15 period is a public comment period that is for everyone 16 involved, no matter what the supplemental testimony or 17 what have you. And when that time came for when that 18 30 days was over, that was over. You couldn't say, 19 "Oh, I'm a panelist. Therefore, I get the opportunity 20 on day 31 or 32." 21 And I think that should be communicated 22 clearly to the panelists as well that this is the 23 magical time because otherwise it delays our review, 24 staff review, whatever review of other materials that 25 are out there.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, that makes sense, and I think that this conversation is one that was initially started by, I believe, Commissioner Braceras and Kirsanow basically and Commissioner Melendez, the need to have some formal rules in place regarding our briefings. And we will discuss that, I believe, later in the agenda, but on that particular issue, I agree with you. I think that there needs to be a cutoff. Now, I don't believe that any panelist has supplemented their testimony, you know, far off into the future. So it's not clear to me that --COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that's where I. would beg to differ. I would say that the large volume of materials that I received in the middle of last week relating to the K through 12 briefing was, indeed, July to August, September, two and a half months practically from the time of the first briefing that these materials showed up, and they showed up a few days around the time that we were supposed to be delivering comments on a first draft of a briefing report. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. COMMISSIONER YAKI: So that's the point that I'm making.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, all right.
2	Well, I think you make good points, and I think that
3	we will cover this topic later on in this meeting.
4	Okay. Any other comments, questions?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. All in
7	favor say aye.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, no, I still have
9	a question.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What source materials?
12	Are we talking about all of the sources materials?
13	The ones that are distributed September 1, 4th and
14	6th?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You're asking I'm
16	sorry. Rephrase the question.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We are taking into the
18	record everyone's source materials?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All of the panelists.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor
22	say aye.
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Objections?
25	COMMISSIONER YAKİ: Aye, me. Sorry. I
	NEAL D. CDOCC

1	object.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let the record
3	reflect that all voted in favor with the exceptions of
4	Commissioners Yaki and Melendez. The motion carries.
5	Okay. May I have a motion that the
6	Commission conduct the Commission briefing and
7	business meeting currently scheduled for November 17th
8	on November 9th? Under this motion, the Commissioners
9	would be able to provide comments on the draft
10	briefing report circulated on September 29th, 2006 and
11	would vote on the briefing report on November 9th.
12	Concurring and dissenting statements would
13	be due on the 9th.
14	Is there a second?
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Did anybody move
16	that? You need a motion.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Comments.
22	Commissioner Yaki.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm going to start
24	off. I think Commissioner Melendez has more detailed
25	comments. I'm just going to start off by saying this

is nutty. When we received I don't know how many hundreds, a thousand or so pages of additional source materials in the first week of October on this issue.

When it was received, when it was implied that it was relied upon in great detail for the draft, that we have this artificially compressed time schedule that is ad hoc and does not really follow any sort of formal procedure other than simple expediency in terms of the end game for the deadline with incredibly short times for a dissent to be written given that the vote will not be until the third and then ten days to do a dissent on a document that if I were to estimate has about three to 4,000 pages of source materials, in addition to the volumes of testimony during the hearing.

I think this is a gross misuse of the briefing process. A gross misuse. There is no process, and I would just say that I have serious concerns about the ability, my ability, to write a dissent in a short period of time, wading through all of these materials, given that the first draft, which is not going to be obviously the final draft, was only distributed about a week and a half ago.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. In response, you will have until, assuming that you dissent,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

November 9th to write your dissent, and I agree that there is a lot of material to wade through, and I also agree that the burden for those who dissent are not the same as the majority since you'll have to actually do the writing.

But the reason for the dates that have been selected is that this is an important topic, a topic that will be heard by the Supreme Court, and I think that it's extremely important that the Commission participate in the debate.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think, with all due respect, Mr. Chair, I think the idea of a month from the time that we saw the first draft to the time a . dissent is supposed to be written when the process should allow us at least a month to review the draft in the first place; I just think regardless of what the deadline is for the Supreme Court, the fact of the matter is that there's an integrity to the process that's going forward, that should go forward and should accompany what we do, and if we're simply saying, "Well, gee, there's something hot going on right now. So we're going to shift all of our gears. We're going to essentially say to anyone who might disagree, well, we're sorry that we and the entire resources of staff and others to write this report for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you and look at 6,000 pages of materials, and you have one month to figure out what it is we wrote and then figure out how to do a dissent from that, I think, is unfair.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. As you know,

I sent in the memo to most of the Commissioners. I

was more concerned about process as far as -- and time

frames also. I know that many times we don't have

enough time to respond, especially if things are

changing, if material is being sent into us and we're

'asking a question of, well, what does that actually

mean; does it change the opinion of the draft report.

And I ask the question of whether or not even the Al administrative instruction 1.6 applied to this type, you know, the report process where it actually states in there I believe we should have one month or four weeks to actually comment. I believe that Staff Director Marcus said that he did not feel that that was applicable to the 1.6, Section 14 and all of those different places that basically applied, the time frames and all of those different things.

The other thing is that, you know, the question would be whether or not when we get testimony, if it's just basically writing a report

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that had everybody's testimony, but if for some reason we start to alter the report, such as in the native Hawaiians, where our own staff starts to put in their own opinions on the outcome of the briefing, you know, then I think that the Commissioners, even myself, should be able to look at that because we have a document that seems to change.

And the question would be when do we actually say that it's a closed report and nothing is going to change, and then we can comment on that. But

actually say that it's a closed report and nothing is going to change, and then we can comment on that. But the way I see it, things seem to gradually be changing with submittals of the panelists, with time frames changing as to when do we actually review what's being submitted.

So I have a real concern on time frames as to our input, and I recognize that the Supreme Court decisions or Supreme Court hearings are in place and we're on the fast track, but we sure don't want to send something up there that we're not all agreeable to and that's irrelevant to the briefing and not really just opinions of staff within Civil Rights Commission office here. So I do have a concern.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry, and you -COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May I speak to
those concerns?

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Commissioner Braceras.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just a bit of history about the process. When the new leadership at this Commission was appointed, one of the first things we did was establish a working group on reform to address some of the procedural issues, and the rules that you cite to are basically the rules that the working group came up with to deal with Commissioner input and time lines for reports coming out of hearings.

And so I agree with the Staff Director that they don't apply to this particular situation. However, I also agree with Commissioner Melendez and Commissioner Yaki that there needs to be a process for these other types of reports because what we didn't anticipate when we came up with those rules was that the model that we use was going to shift. So we came up with rules for reports that were not now currently making the mainstay of our work.

And I do believe that the spirit of those rules should apply to briefing reports, but one of the reasons that we switched to the briefing report model was not to avoid application of the rules, but in order to be more timely and relevant and

## NEAL R. GROSS

1.5

2.2

potentially be cited more, and all of those other things, to be able to do shorter, quicker, less labor intensive, but more timely topics.

So I think that while we definitely need rules and in many ways the rules will be similar to the ones we've established for larger reports, they do need some revision and tinkering to make them more applicable to a briefing format.

And I'm a huge process person. So I hear your concerns, and you know, my recommendation would be to ask the Staff Director to try to revise the current rules that are in place, revise them in a way that will reflect the needs of the briefing process and shorter time frames so that we can have those rules in place as quickly as possible, hopefully by the November-December meeting, recognizing that the staff is stretched and that putting together rules takes time.

The only reason I don't recommend that it be done at the working group level is because I think as we've all seen, you know, we all have other jobs and other demands on our time, and I think sometimes, you know, establishing a working group can actually make things take longer.

And so in the interest of addressing your

concerns quickly, I would ask the staff director to 1 come up with a set of rules that addresses process 2 3 within the next two months. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki. 4 I appreciate what COMMISSIONER YAKI: 5 6 Commissioner Braceras has said. I was part of that working group on reform and fully participated and 7 felt included as part of that process under her 8 9 leadership. I want to say that Commissioner Braceras 10 ,11 described how the briefing issue involved, actually I remember that I was part of that movement 12 to push the Commission into doing briefings, but to my . 13 14 chagrin, it has changed. 15 When we first talked about 16 briefings, I think when you look at the AI, Section 17 12.01, that pretty much sums up what I believe that 18 briefings were supposed to be. They would be used by 19 the Commission, quote, to provide Commissioners and 20 the general public insight into civil rights issues 21 without the formality of a hearing. We understood we didn't have the budget to 22 23 do formal hearings. We talk about that all the time, how much extra it costs, how much more time it takes, 24

how much more staff preparation and what have you.

25

doing

But again, and maybe this is just my own experience, but in the legislative world that I used to exist in, briefings were just that. They were briefings. They were for people to come give opinion, give their insight, give their testimony, give their what have you on an issue to illuminate it, shed light on it, provoke further thought and debate.

What has happened during that time period and why I'm concerned about that has happened to the briefing process is that they've turned into mini national reports, and I think Commissioner Braceras hit it on the head. It's essentially becoming the same type of thing, except (a) without the process attached to it and (b) it's more than just this kind of a process. There's an integrity to the form hearing or to the formal report process, which gives a better data wash and review to the materials that are presented.

I think the worse case in point was the Hawaii report where we looked at findings and recommendations that came out of nowhere for most of us in terms of what the source materials were, who made the interpretations and what have you.

And I think rather than simply say, "Well, that's a fault of the staff," I think, no, it's a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

fault of how briefings have been converted since the original intent of this, and if they're being converted into mini national reports, they need to be treated like mini national reports for the purposes of the intellectual and scholastic rigor that goes with it.

That's why I have a fundamental problem

That's why I have a fundamental problem with this process. For example, the Adarand, which was our first big report that we did, was a very inclusive process. I dissented, yes, but I felt like I had adequate time to review, to study, and that was without an assistant, which I still do not have.

In this process, a report that is by the Chair's own admission timed to coincide with a deadline for essentially reply briefs for the Supreme Court cases in Seattle and Louisville, I am being given substantially less time to discuss it, to understand it, to review it, to critique it.

I mean, my dissent in Adarand was a two to three-month process in the making. It was something that started with the first draft. I started to think about where we were going, what have you.

We got this first draft just what, a week and a half ago, I think? Not much more. We had to have our comments in by what, the minth or something?

I don't know. It was an incredibly short period of time. The last week of September and then the comments were due the first week of October. Here we are barely in the second week.

That to me really violates the spirit of what it is we're trying to do and, I believe, runs a serious risk of tainting the reliability, the academic and scholastic rigor of a report that, again, by the Chair's own statement, he wishes to be heard or be seen or be cited or at least reviewed by those dealing with the Supreme Court cases in Seattle and Louisville.

And, you know, from September 28th, I believe, to November 13th, start to finish, with a passel of materials this big coming in the middle of that to deal with I think is difficult to justify.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, Commissioners Yaki and Melendez, you've made some arguments that resonate with I would say most of the Commissioners, if not all. I think that in response to your strong arguments, at least some of them, that we will --well, I agree with most of what you said, but not all -- but in any event, I think that Commissioner Braceras' recommendation is a good one, and I think that it will address many of the process issues that

# NEAL R. GROSS

2.0

you've just discussed, and in terms of the current
issue on the table, I think that rather than have the
meeting rather than move it to the ninth, we stick
with the 17th and provide an additional week after
that meeting for dissents and concurrences.
How do you respond to that as an attempt
that compromise?
COMMISSIONER YAKI: I need dates. I'm not
too sure what you just meant by the ninth versus
the I thought it was the third.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What I said was the
meeting would take place on the date scheduled, which
is the 17th, and that dissents and concurrences would .
be due on the 24th.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Of?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Of November.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Of November?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER YAKI: What holiday does that
run into?
COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: The 24th is
Thanksgiving, isn't it?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thanksgiving?
COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: The day after
Thanksgiving.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right, all right.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Not that I have any
3	aversion to working through the turkey.
4 .	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, how about
5	this? Let's make it the 27th.
6	(Pause in proceedings.)
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I ask a
8	question?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: While we're
11	mulling these dates, is there also a date by which
12	comments on the draft will be due and the second draft
13	circulated if there are going to be changes made,
14	stylistic or what have you, to the current document?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Since my
16	picking dates without consulting with staff may cause
17	some problems, Ken, would that approach affect you
18	folks?
19	(The Chair conferred with staff.)
20	MR. MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, if the meeting
21	continues to be on the 17th rather than the date you
22	had indicated earlier, then we would do the mail-out
23	of the proposed final on the ninth. If we use the
24	ninth, then we would need to get Commissioner comments
25	on the second.

1	We can provide a revised draft by the end
2	of next week. We have not at this point gotten a lot
3	of comments from Commissioners. So the revised draft
4	that we would send by the end of next week will not
5	look terribly different from the first draft.
6	So you would have rom the end of next week
7	until approximately the second for your second round
8	of comments, and then the proposed final on the ninth.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Does any
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And then the vote
11	would be on the 17th?
12	MR. MARCUS: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And then the dissents .
14	would be due on the 27th?
15	MR. MARCUS: Twenty-seventh, and I would
16	just say pushing it a little bit there, it's pushing
17	it a little bit in terms of getting the materials on
18	the Website in advance of the fifth. It should be
19	enough time, assuming that GPO maintains its regular
20	schedule during the holidays.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Fifth of?
22	MR. MARCUS: I think we can get it done.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Fifth of?
24	MR. MARCUS: December.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is there some magic to

that date?

MR. MARCUS: That makes the oral argument the 4th or 5th of December.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I just want to make an observation as a follow-up to the comments by Commissioner Braceras that we take a look at or the Staff Director and the staff take a look at devising rules with respect to the process by which briefing reports are compiled. I think I wholeheartedly agree with that recommendation.

The observation is just that in the context of where the Commission has been and where it is now, the manner in which briefing reports are put together is not a stark departure from what had been done prior to the working group formulating the current process. In fact, it probably provides as much, if not more, integrity to the process by which hearing reports had been put together in the past.

Not quite, but I just want to note that in the past reports were put together and dissents also in somewhat of a truncated fashion, in some cases to be timely, and I think back to the Florida 2000 report where copious information and data and a need to reconcile conflicting analyses that were quite

detailed and complicated were done in a very short 1 time frame. 2 3 I think that I may be mistaken. Somebody can correct me, but the dissent was crafted within a 4 month or so of the majority report being issued. That 5 6 was a significant issue that was being addressed and 7 had the context of a presidential election. were expert reports, and yet a hearing report was put 8 9 together, a dissent also. 10 And I think that the current briefing 11 reports, although I do think we need a response to 12 what Commissioner Yaki has indicated, a process 13 Commissioner suggested by Braceras to address · 14 briefings as opposed to hearing reports; I think the 15 end product, while it could be improved, nonetheless 16 is probably as rigorous or close to as rigorous as 17 what the reports were under the hearing regime 18 previously. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that damning with 20 faint praise? 21 (Laughter.) 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean, with all due 23 respect, one of the -- I mean, this was obviously one 24 of the concerns that I heard when I first joined this

a year ago and why I wholeheartedly

body over

supported Commissioner Braceras' reform efforts to add 1 more layers of review, input, and comment for that. 2 So I'm sorry if I sounded facetious, but 3 as my wife told me before, "You've really had no 4 sleep, Yaki. You really should think twice before you 5 say anything today." 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think that point 7 8 is that I'm not so sure that there is a dearth of 9 integrity in the processes by which we are putting together the briefing reports. It can be improved, 10 11 but I don't think that it necessarily lays bare some kind of huge defects with respect to the briefing 12 reports or the process by which we're getting there. 13 14 And I trust staff is doing -- we have 15 disagreements as to the outcomes on some of these 16 briefing reports, but I think the staff is doing a good job in making sure that they have a certain 17 18 degree of rigor attached to them. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I will second 20 the Chair's amended schedule. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So just --22 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: A question I had. 23 You know, on the recommendation to put together a 24 procedure in some manner that is basically outside of 25 the administrative instruction, is that what we're

actually going to do? 1 does that become a valid And how 2 3 procedure? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. I don't think 4 that's what's being suggested. I think that we 5 6 will --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I didn't hear 7 Commissioner Melendez. I'm sorry. 8 9 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Just going back to 10 your recommendation. 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm still stopped 12 up from the plane. 13 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Working on . 14 procedures, because I had raised a question that the 15 Staff Director said that we don't really follow the 16 administrative instruction for parts. The question 17 would be if we're going to work on some other 18 procedure that has to do with review, legal review and 19 everything else having to do with comments, what 20 basically type of procedure -- is that incorporated 21 into -- because this is the -- you know, it seems like 22 everything within the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, a 23 federal agency basically, just has to it seems 24 document every type of procedure that you have.

And it's one thing to have kind of

39 informal type, even if they were adopted ourselves, to something that's internal, but when we're sending out documents that are basically used in Supreme Court cases that are sent to Congress or wherever. It would just seem to me that that has to be in some way incorporated into some type of similar administrative instructions even if, you know, the validity of it --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think I can that question. The thought is that basically have a framework in place that needs to be tailored to the new model, and that the Staff

Director's office would take a crack at revising the rules that we have, altering time frames and the like, . so that it would apply to the briefing model.

And then that would be brought forward by the Staff Director as soon as possible, but hopefully the next meeting, for presentation the Commissioners, you know, distributed with the meeting materials beforehand, and we could vote on it or make changes to it and then vote on it as a Commission, and would vote to have it incorporated administrative instruction.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So two issues. I guess the one issue, let's be clear on the dates. The deadline for receiving comments would be November

> **NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	2nd. The mail-out would occur on November 9th. The
2	Commission meeting will remain as scheduled on
3	November 17th.
4	The dissents, the deadline for dissents
5	and concurrences would be the 27th of November.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
7	MR. MARCUS: And the next staff draft will
8	come up by the end of next week.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I seconded that.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Very good. All
12	in favor?
13	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any dissents?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any concurrences? The
17	motion passes unanimously. Thank you for your good
18	work, Commissioner Braceras. I like your
19	recommendation that we tighten up our have some
20	formal policies with regard to how we do our
21	briefings.
22	Okay. May I have a motion that the
23	Commission accept into the record the materials
24	received for the September 8th briefing on racially
25	identifiable school districts?

1	Thus far we have received just one letter
2	with several attachments from Nebraska State Senator
3	Ron Raikes, who is the Chair of the Education
4	Committee of the Nebraska legislature.
5	May I have a motion?
6	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
10	Commissioner Yaki.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I wasn't sure what I
12	should do with it. I got a gigantic package from one
13	of the people who was in the audience addressed to me
14	full of materials and other choice objects.
15	Would that be
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What kind of
17	choice objects?
18	(Laughter.)
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It wasn't Omaha
20	State's. That's all I can tell you.
21	I mean it was addressed to me, but I think
22	it was also it seemed to be intended for the entire
23	Commission. I would like if we could incorporate
24	that. I think we will have it sent on to you
25	forthwith. I just realized that.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I assume that there
2	are no objections.
3	MR. MARCUS: We're talking only about
4	documents, correct?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
6	MR. MARCUS: He's keeping the objects.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The objects will
8	remain in your house.
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions or
11	comments?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor please
14	say well, all in favor of the motion as amended by
15	Yaki, please say aye.
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Any
18	concurrences?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion carries.
21	Mr. Staff Director, do'you have an update
22	on the campus anti-Semitism public education campaign?
23	MR. MARCUS: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
24	Chairman.
25	We continued working with the outside
l	

organizations that I've referred to in prior meetings, and in general I think that they are very excited about the work that we are doing. Staff prepared a draft set of Web pages

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that would be included within our general Website, and these Web pages would address the issue of anti-Semitism on campuses. We circulated that for comment to the Commissioners a couple of weeks back. also asked for input from various outside groups.

In general, the responses that we have gotten have been very favorable; and they have gotten some very positive cudos to the staff for the quality of work, which I think is great.

Staff is continuing to fine tune the Web response to some useful, constructive pages in criticism, and we will shortly circulate another draft that is revised in response to the comments we've received, and I would hope to have a proposed final of those Web pages available for a vote during the next Commission meeting.

addition In to the Web pages, Commission is aware that we have a poster that was approved during the last meeting, and that the image and language from the poster is also being used on a postcard that the Commission previously directed the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	staff to prepare.
2	I'll circulate this, but the Commissioners
3	will see that the postcard has essentially the same
4	image and text as the poster. We've added the TDY
5	number for disabled persons as well as an E-mail
6	address for our complaint line. We'll probably
7	increase somewhat some of the text to make it more
8	legible.
9	So we will have the poster. We will have
10	this. We will be sending out E-mails and have gotten
11	requests to speak with various students and student
12	groups and faculty. So I would say at this point the
13	feedback that we're getting has been very positive.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any questions or
15	comments?
16	(No response.)
17	V. State Advisory Committee Issues
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up, we're
19	going to discuss the rechartering packages. We have
20	three. May I have a motion to recharter the Georgia
21	State Advisory Committee?
22	Under this motion the Commission appoints
23	the following individuals to that committee based on
24	the recommendations of the Staff Director:
25	Charles Tankslev

1	Tony Boatwright
2	Alvin Culbreth
3	Julius Dudley
4 .	Herbert Garrett
5	Shannon Goessling
6.	William Jordan
7	Ann Kasun
8	Luis Eguiarte
9	Arch Stokes
10	and Pamela White-Colbert
11	And with this motion, the Commission
12	appoints Charles Tanksley as the Chair of the newly
13	rechartered Georgia State Advisory Committee. These
14	members will serve as uncompensated government
15	employees, and the Commission, assuming that this
16	motion passes, will appreciate the hard work that they
17	will contribute to this SAC.
18	Under this motion, the Commission
19	authorizes the Staff Director to execute the
20	appropriate paper work for the appointment.
21	Is there a second?
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Mr. Chairman, I
23	had a question, I believe at the last meeting. I had
24	a concern about the rechartering of especially
25	Connecticut, and I believe when we agreed to not block

1	that on a notational voting, there was agreement that
2	we would discuss basically rechartering in general of
3	how that process actually works.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: And maybe that
6	should be done before the vote on these.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, actually I
8	assumed that this would be the vehicle used
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: for that
11	discussion.
12	So is there a second?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So moved.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
15	A second?
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. The whole
19	process on how the SACs are basically picked all the
20	way down was a concern that I had because when we did
21	look at the Connecticut SACs, there was a number of
22	and basically I believe that the recharter decision
23	should avoid, you know, bias and that we should create
24	a diverse, active, and capable membership of the make-
25	up of the SAC.

I do have a concern as to the process in general. If a person were to basically want to be a State Advisory Committee person, who would that actually occur? Is it a top-down or bottom-up?

Because I know that even with the regional directors not even being in place out in Western Region, I believe, Mr. Pilla there is basically holding down the fort. I think he's basically second in command. I don't think some of the regions even have directors.

As to how the names are actually put forth, I know that the staff director has some involvement in working with the different regional directors as to how that list is put together, and in looking at some of the recharters, you know, some of them basically lack number of women. I believe the outcome of some of those actually have only two women on some of the recharters that we looked at in these packages, and I think the question would be: is it something that's basically determined within each state or is it basically driven by the central office here as to the list, you know, that goes out to the different states?

Because I think that even the State Advisory Committees themselves, they have no idea as

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

It's

to who's going to be sitting on their board. probably somebody else making those recommendations. I'm just thinking it should be bottom-up, that the people within each respective state probably can put forth names, or how would we as commissioners? Are we supposed to be able to put forth names to these rechartering because we would know basically some of the regions or where we come from? I just wanted to talk a little bit about the process of getting a more diverse and well rounded --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And if I could just speak sort of generally, and I know the Staff. Director can answer the specifics of the process. You know, we do have rules in place, and we did revise our policy for SAC selection and adopt a very specific set of goals and objectives. So there are rules in place. At the time that we adopted those, our goal was to have race and gender neutral criteria for selection, obviously with the goal of viewpoint diversity on the SACs, and with the goal that, you know, all of the members are interested in and committed to civil rights issues.

But our goal was to strive for viewpoint

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 2 3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

diversity and to have race neutral criteria because we felt that, you know, we certainly didn't want to allocate slots on the SACs by quota. So we specifically sought to eliminate rules that might be interpreted that way.

individual As for how members are selected, I know in the past I've, you know, given a name or two of somebody who I thought might be interested. Marti Castro, who's on the list today for Illinois, is somebody that I originally recommended. You know, he's not from my political party. He's much more liberal than I am. He's a community activist, and somebody with whom I share a great interest in . that affect the Hispanic community, issues somebody with whom I often find myself disagreeing with on political matters.

But I knew him to be a person committed to civil rights issues and a person who would be interested in serving, and so I passed his name along, and I'm sure that any other Commissioner, you know, should certainly feel free to do that.

But the Staff Director can speak more specifically about the process, but just to address your concern about whether there is a process, the answer is yes, and I believe a very well thought out

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 || one.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And to answer your concern about diversity, we have, you know, developed a policy that's race and gender neutral.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: But I guess you only can have 11 people on each advisory board. Let's say there's 17 that --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that true?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: make application, and we look at their resumes, which I think should have something to do with their interest in serving on civil rights because I read some of the one sin Georgia this morning, reading what their interests are and their background and different things, but the question would be how are those actually selected because I know that doesn't seem like the state advisory chairman or whether or not there's five people still on the board and there's six new people coming on, whether or not it's actually the Regional Director that really basically makes a decision narrowing it down from 16 to 11 people or is it the staff director here or is it something that we review the 15 and throw our ten cents into who the 11 should be?

That's what I'm kind of getting at as to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	who would make that decision so that it could be
2	and I don't know if anybody really looked into it
3	before, but I'm just saying that it's kind of coming
4	to the forefront because these are basically four-year
5	terms now; is that right?
6	MR. MARCUS: That's correct.
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Four-year terms as
8	opposed to two. So I think
9	MR. MARCUS: No, I'm sorry. They remain
10	two-year terms, but we have a pending recommendation
11	to expand it to four-year terms.
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: It could end up
13	there. So I'm just saying I think we need to really
14	look at the process and be able to have input if
15	that's part of our role as Commission.
16	MR. MARCUS: I'd be happy to answer if I
17	may.
18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Sure.
19	MR. MARCUS: There is a very complicated
20	question. So I'll just try and take a stab at it and
21	I'd be happy to take follow-up as well.
22	We do have a process. As Commissioner
23	Braceras pointed out, it was extensively revised over
24	the course of the last year. So it's a newly reworked
25	process, and it's a process that now intends to be

23

24

25

race and gender neutral and to bring in a wide range of viewpoints and to bring fresh new perspectives into the committees.

the The members appointed by are Commission. The ultimate responsibility in the selection is with the Commissioners. Commissioners vote yes or no, and in the past occasionally Commissioners would, if they were unsatisfied with the proposals, would vote no and give recommendations that the staff go back and find this or that. Sometimes there were no Republicans or no this or not that.

The recommendations are made by the Staff Director. So the Commission typically votes based on the recommendations of the Staff Director.

As Staff Director, I rely on various staff members to assist me in developing my recommendations. The primary people that I rely upon are the regional directors. We have six regions. We have four regional directors. For those two regions where we do not have regional directors, the Staff Director is the de facto acting regional director.

But as Commissioner Melendez points out, in each of those two regions, I have very active senior analysts who are very helpful in coordinating the process for me in those areas.

The ways that we have looked at the SACs vary little bit from state to state and region to region. That has, in part, been based on the different needs. For instance, we have some states where we are building an entire committee from scratch because we have no eligible incumbents.

In other states, we have only a small number. so we have different things we need to look at.

Where we have a number of incumbent members who are being considered for reselection, we have to look at what is their background and what is needed in order to provide balance. For instance, are they all of one party and do we need to get people of another party in? Do they have the full range of skill sets and backgrounds that we're looking for?

Generally speaking, I try to let the different regional staff be as creative as they can and proactive in putting together committees, but I am concerned to instill a sense of urgency because I think it is very important that we move ahead quickly. As the Commissioner probably knows, under the old process we almost never were rechartering SACs. Most of the time most SACs were not chartered for as far back as anyone in headquarters can remember. So we're

trying to rectify that, even though we have fewer resources and less money and staff.

We also did not have the sort of viewpoint diversity that is called for under the new procedures.

In terms of my involvement, I've tried to encourage and coach the regional staff. I have encouraged Commissioners to provide recommendations to me, and many Commissioners have provided some names. Those who have, I thank you and I encourage you to keep them coming.

For those of you who have not yet provided any suggestions, I would encourage you to please let me know who you are aware of, and as with any manager, my degree of involvement in the different tasks depends on a whole host of factors, including how much time I have available, how well things are going in a particular state, whether a subordinate specifically asks for me to help, whether I think that there's a particular need in a particular region to get more involved, whether I think I have value to add.

The Connecticut SAC I think is an excellent example of one that came together very well, and I think that the Georgia SAC as well as other sacs within that region are also a good example of excellent staff work.

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Right. I guess
2	the question would be I think in the Connecticut SAC
3	there were a couple of women that seemed to be
4	qualified, you know. So let's take that scenario.
5	would that be something where a Commissioner would
6	basically lay it on the table and say, "Why weren't
7	these two women who seemed to be qualified not
8	included or selected?"
9	Basically I don't think we get down to
10	that type of inquiry or we haven't.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. Women
12	who were considered but not selected?
13	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: But not selected.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or just women you
15	know about who had interest?
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No, they were
17	actually I believe they were in the could have
18	been selected or appointed by Mr. Marcus or the
19	regional director.
20	MR. MARCUS: We had a number of people in
21	Connecticut whom we looked at. There were 15 that I
22	recommended. Commissioner Melendez, you pointed out
23	that we need to have 11 members. In fact, 11 is the
24	minimum. Nineteen is the maximum. We have tended for
25	our smaller states, in general, to have numbers that

are closer to 11 and for larger often closer to 19. 2 The 15 that we chose I think were an 3 excellent, well balanced group. In addition to that 4 15, it is true there were a number of people that we 5 looked at, including both men and women. 6 Commissioner, you may be referring to a couple of women that the staff actually send my way. There were 7 also some very talented, interesting men. 8 There was 9 one rabbi, a man who -- we didn't have a rabbi, and I 10 don't know that we've got a rabbi in any committee, 11 and he was very well known. 12 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We do. 13 There were the --MR. MARCUS: 14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We do? 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yeah, Ι remember 16 seeing him in one of them. 17 MR. MARCUS: Okay. A staff member was 18 enthusiastic about the idea of bringing in a rabbi. 19 There were a couple of women. 20 a professor, I think, at Yale, and there's nothing 21 wrong with any of these people. Any of them would 2.2 have been terrific. It was just a matter of if we 23 accepted all of them, it would have been too many, 24 which means of the expense sometimes of bringing them 25 all together, plus the burden, you know, in terms of

1	the time constraints would have been too much.
2	In the ideal world I think I might have
3	gone for a number smaller than 15, but it was tough
4	cutting it beyond the 15. So it was just a matter of
5	getting as close as I could to 11 or 12, but trying to
6	get good balance, trying to get viewpoint balance, et
7	cetera, et cetera.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.
9	I'm sorry.
.0	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Go ahead. I'll let
11	Commissioner Melendez finish. I'm sorry.
L2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: And my main
L3	concern is, you know, when we're talking about either
.4	the top-down, which would basically be you from the
L5	top basically setting forth a list out to the regional
.6	directors or either the regional directors start
.7	getting more involved because they know their certain
.8	region and they basically send you a number, a list,
.9	and basically you kind of concur with them whether or
20	not these are that would be the bottom-up approach.
21	So if the two women, for example, were put
22	forth by the regional director, I guess that would be
3	the bottom up approach.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's
5	discretionary. So it can go either way. The names

1	can be generated by Commissioners or by the Staff
2	Director or members of his staff or by the regional
3	directors, and it's within his discretion. There's no
4	rule that requires him to accept the nomination of the
5	regional director or that requires him to accept my
6	suggestion. It's within his discretion, and that's a
7	process that we discussed at great length and voted
8	on, and so that's how it works.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yeah, I just want to
10	add one thing. The ultimate decision is ours.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. We vote as
12	a body, collectively.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want to go on
15	the record as to why I had a problem with Connecticut,
16	and I appreciate what the Staff Director has said. My
17	issue though is that I find it hard to understand that
18	diversity of viewpoint includes three people in the
19	executive board of one organization, which is the
20	Yankee Institute for Public Policy, comprising 30
21	percent or three out of ten of the new nominees.
22	I have an issue with the fact that the
23	number of women is so low. Yes, you can be race and
24	gender neutral, but I think we should also understand
25	that especially for the State of Connecticut and its

place in the history of Supreme Court jurisprudence, 1 having a SAC that is at present 87 percent men and 13 2 percent women is something that should put up red 3 flags right away. 4 And then finally, and I am going to say 5 this as politely as I can, but I don't know if I'm --6 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Remember that you 8 haven't had much sleep. 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, but I have triple 10 screened this so far, but I still don't know if it's 11 going to come out right. 12 I have a very, very deep issue what a 13 member of the new SAC is someone who heads an . 14 organization that is unalterably opposed to the idea 15 of (pause) --16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: is What the 17 organization? 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- of same sex unions, 19 the Family Institute of Connecticut. I think that 20 this is an organization whose Website I perused, who 21 I believe and, in fact, I hope one day -- I don't know 22 when that will be -- but I hope one day if I am still 23 a member of the Commission we would have a discussion 24 about the civil rights or lack thereof for the gay and 25 lesbian, transgender community, but I have --

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's not within
2	our statutory mandate.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Neither was neither
4	were the rights of the disabled until we put out a
5	report on the people that dealt with the challenges
6	faced by people with disabilities.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think that is
8	part of our statutory mandate, isn't it?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think it is.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think he's making a
12	different point, but at one point it wasn't. I
13	believe that
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, it was not. It
15	was not.
16	MR. MARCUS: I have to say there are
17	issues related to the gay and lesbian community that
18	are fairly within our jurisdiction.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And in this we have
20	someone who advocates and rates legislators, puts out
21	bulletins, et cetera, that is unalterably opposed to
22	the rights of same sex unions, and that person is now
23	in our SAC, and I have a very severe problem with
24	that.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you suggesting

1	that that person should have been disqualified,
2	especially in light of the fact that there are many
3	Americans who share his view?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we really don't
5	want to go down that road, do we?
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, no, I'm just
7	asking you a question. Do you believe that someone
8	who is opposed to same sex marriage is ineligible to
9	serve in a SAC?
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think I'm not saying
11	that. I would say for me, I would have asked to have
12	a separate vote on him. And, again, I don't think we
13	want to go down a road that says, well, a majority of
14	Americans may not believe these people or those people
15	deserve these kinds of rights. That's not a place for
16	me to be.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't know if
18	that's what the Chairman was saying.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A fully informed
20	debate having all of the viewpoints represented, and
21	I don't see how we can have a fully fleshed out debate
22	unless all of the voices are presented.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So does that mean that
24	in 1957 the Civil Rights Commission should have had an
25	unalterable segregationist as part of us?

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that all
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that what you're
3	saying, Mr. Chair?
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I am saying
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Because if that's what
6	you're saying
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no, no.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: then
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let me tell you what
10	I"m saying. I am saying that all viewpoints should be
11	heard, and there is no point of view that should be
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Viewpoints
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: eliminated from the
14	discussion.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: can be heard, but
16	to be a member of the SAC, to be a member of the Civil
17	Rights Commission family, I have a very, very deep
18	problem with that, and that is my personal point of
19	view.
20	I'm not imposing it upon you. I'm not
21	asking you to adopt it. I'm simply saying that I am
22	very proud of the fact that in my history as a
23	legislator I participated in civil unions in terms of
24	officiating at them. I come from a city that embraces
25	that kind of diversity, and it would be anathema for

me not to express my objection to inclusion of someone 1 of that mindset as a member of the Connecticut SAC. 2 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor. 4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: A process question. 5 Since this is our decision, are we limited to voting 6 on a slate when we are receiving recommendations from 7 the Staff Director? 8. I think that any CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. 9 -- if there's an individual --10 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- that someone has a 12 particular problem with, that they could vote against 13 that particular individual. 14 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Well, from my 15 perspective at least, all of the concerns raised, I 16 think we have a forum to address all of them. 17 is, when the particular SAC is brought to the table 18 for a vote, if we're not required to accept the entire 19 slate recommendations, we can do exactly what 20 Commissioner Yaki would like to do in this case, focus 21 on individuals, their backgrounds, and question them, and I think that's a good debate to have, and I sense 22 23 we're a tempest in a teapot here because we have a process in place to have these very discussions on 24 25 particular SACs, but I don't hear any concern related

to the Georgia SAC, which I thought was the motion on 1 2 the table. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's true, but 3 Commissioner Yaki wanted to express his views on 4 certain aspects of the Connecticut SAC, and --5 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Which we had agreed 6 to as part of our discussion. 7 Which I don't want -- if PARTICIPANT: 8 it's a procedural defect, then it would apply to this 9 10 Georgia discussion, but if it's not a procedural 11 defect, then I don't want us to lose track of where we 12 are on particular SACs, and we can focus on the 13 Georgia SAC when it comes up or the Connecticut SAC . 14 when it comes up. 15 PARTICIPANT: Well, so long as there is an 16 understanding we have a process in place to address 17 the concerns Commissioner Yaki has raised. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Additional 19 questions, comments? 20 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Just a final 21 comment from myself, and the reason I raise this is 22 because, you know, it's the discretion of the Staff 23 Director playing a big role in the whole process. I . 24 just wanted to let him know that, you know, we're going to be looking at that, and if the process can be 25

65 so that we can have input into questionable people on there like we've discussed here, that would be, you know, something we would like to do or, you know, to make sure that -- I'm just trying to make sure that it's well balanced, you know, so that we don't question if it's stacked along party lines or whatever was brought up or whether or not we don't have enough women, and that's my main concern. And so that I just wanted to just bring it to the forefront so that we could have the discussion on it and make sure that we could have input into the SACs.

I think we're so busy that sometimes if we .

just kind of rubber stamp the SACs the way it has been going, but I think that we're going to be -- and I know that we have a number of SACs we still have to So we've only touched base with some of So even if it's in the middle of the process, I think we still need to kind of take into account that there are issues there, and if we can streamline the process or get more input, and that's the reason we brought it up.

MR. MARCUS: Commissioner, I welcome your involvement and share your concern about trying to get the proper balance and want to take the invitation

#### **NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	that I've given to all of the Commissioners and make
2	it especially to you that if there are people that you
3	have in mind also or are concerned, please don't
4	hesitate to give me a call and let me know. I'd be
5	happy to work with you.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And there's very few
7	decisions made around here where we don't rely on the
8	Staff Director's judgment. In my view the Staff
9	Director's judgment has been sound, but more
LO	importantly, there is a checks and balance system in
11	place. We are the ultimate arbiters of what goes on
12	around here.
13	Okay. If there are no additional
L4	questions or comments, all in favor of
L5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait, wait. On
16	Georgia?
۱7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a problem
L9	I'd just like to raise a question about one nominee.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which one?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Stokes. I find it
22	very interesting I find it very bizarre that
23	someone would say that discrimination is not a
24	Democrat or a Republican issue, blah, blah, blah,
25	blah, blah. "Civil rights should not be used as

1	either a wedge issue and easy to score political
2	points. It should be conducted in a manner similar to
3	the building of our nation's highways."
4	. What the heck does that mean?
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean, I'm serous.
7	If someone thinks that civil rights should be
8	conducted in a manner similar to the building of our
9	nation's highways, I don't think that person should be
10	on a SAC because I don't think that person understands
11	what in the heck they're talking about.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think we agree
13	with this individual and that civil rights is not a
14	Republican or Democratic issue.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But should it be
16	conducted in a manner similar to building our nation's
17	highways?
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I will admit
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's not the most
20	artful description, but I think he's trying to say
21	it's an American issue. It's not a
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It thought he was
24	trying to say it should be filled by the lowest
25	bidder.
l	

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And then he's
3	suggesting that there are certain ambiguities with
4	that piece of
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: In that case, with a
6	big dig there is no end to it.
7 ·	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If you're suggesting
8	there are certain ambiguities involved in that piece
9	of the statement, I agree, but I don't think that that
LO	disqualifies this individual.
L1	Are there any other individuals you would
L2	like to discuss?
L3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, for now.
L4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The whole slate,
L5	either the whole slate or Stokes?
L6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I don't care. I
L7	mean, again, you know, 73 percent men, 27 percent
L8	women. I mean, it's just out of whack.
L9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So the whole slate
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But we
21	specifically established a policy to avoid bean
22	counts.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Of course, of course,
24	but 73/27? I mean you can do better getting socks out
25	of a drawer in a random thing than doing that.

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just as a matter
2	of curiosity, what was the expression of interest in
3	terms of those who apply to these SAC members? Was
4	there a 50-50 split between men and women who wanted
5	to be SAC members or, you know, what was the pool?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we already know
7	that in Connecticut there were many more women
8	nominated than were chosen.
9	MR. MARCUS: I wouldn't agree with that
LO	characterization.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I thought he said
L2	two.
L3	MR. MARCUS: There were a couple of women
L4	who weren't chosen. There were at least a couple of
L5	men who weren't chosen, and perhaps more than that.
L6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think the SAC chair
L7	said that he nominated he suggested more than a
L8	couple. Anyway.
L9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And I state that,
20	of course, on the premise that, you know, I don't
21	believe we should be bean counting, and I wouldn't
22	necessarily revise my vote depending on what the
23	response is. It's just a matter of curiosity. I
24	don't necessarily think that we can look at the
25	Outcome and say 73 percent men and somehow that's

1	flawed until we know, you know, was there some type of
2	affirmative discrimination against women.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But you need to
4	know the full
5	MR. MARCUS: Here's what I can say.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Eighty-seven, 13, 73,
7	27, 68, 35. That's a pattern and practice to me.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, come on how.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, please.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Come on. Seriously.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Come on now. You're
12	not
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You can't have a
14	pattern and practice without knowing what the pool is.
15	You can't just look at the results.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, then we need
17	then all I can do is look at the numbers. If I don't
18	know what the pool is, if I don't know what the
19	outreach was, if I don't know what
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you just want
21	proportional representation.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: how it was done.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm saying that
24	you can surely do a heck of a lot better than three to
25	one.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If you have a
2	substantive problem with any of these SAC members,
3	then
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have lots of
5	substantive problems with a lot of
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Then raise them.
7	Then raise them.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: a lot of these SAC
9	members.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But the fact that
11	they're not the right sex is I'm not even going to
12	address that.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I'm surprised
14	you wouldn't address it. I would be very I think
15	that I think that if the Civil Rights Commission is
16	supposed to be a body that well, that gets into the
17	whole philosophical issue.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And we had that
19	discussion when we voted on the SAC rules.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Which, of course, I
21	opposed, but I just think you can say a lot about
22	blindness, neutrality, what have you, but I'm just
23	telling you that the numbers are completely out of
24	whack.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, you mentioned a

1	philosophical difference, and there is.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So if these SACs were
3	99 percent Caucasian, you have no problem with it.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Or 100 percent women.
5	I want to know what they think. I want to know what
6	their views are. I want to insure that there is a
7	diversity with respect to ideas. That is the
8	important thing.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we seem to have
10	a lot of people from the Federalist Society in all of
11	these things.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We had three Yankee
14	Institute in one SAC in one state for ten nominees.
15	Where is the diversity? Where is
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I just be
17	perfectly clear about something on the record
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hold on here.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: about the
20	Federalist Society?
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Hold on, hold on, hold
22	on. If you look at the ideological diversity of the
23	SACs, you don't have much. You don't have many
24	members from the Federalist Society or the Yankee
25	Institute. By putting them on these SACs, we are
25	Institute. By putting them on these SACs, we are

achieving diversity, the diversity that we sorely lack today.

So there is no surprise that there is a spike in the number of members from, say, the Federalist Society, for example, because that viewpoint, that point of view is not currently represented on the majority of SACs.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let me just speak to that because I think there's some confusion. The Federalist Society doesn't take positions on issues. There is no Federalist Society viewpoint. There never was; there never will be. It's a Bar Association of generally conservative and libertarian lawyers who sometimes have wildly different views from each other on things like the War on Terror and other issues, and it's basically a forum for ideas and for circulating conservative and libertarian ideas. There are no platforms. Unlike the ACLU, unlike even the American Bar Association, the Federalist Society does not take positions on issues.

So to say that somebody is a member of the Federalist Society and, therefore, you know, shouldn't be a member of a SAC or it's disturbing that they are a member of a SAC --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not disturbed that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

they're members of a SAC. 1 2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It tells me --3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am disturbed -- I am disturbed that of the new nominees there seems to be 4 5 a preponderance or a disproportion of reliance upon 6 certain organizations for the membership of a new SAC. 7 I mean --8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well. the 9 Federalist Society --10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Look, Jennifer 11 Commissioner Braceras. We're not going to agree on this. This goes into the philosophical red state-blue 12 13 state and --14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's fine, but 15 I just want to be clear on the record that membership 16 in the Federalist Society tells you nothing about 17 somebody's (a) political affiliation (b) 18 ideological views, other than the fact that they 19 generally believe in the principles of limited 20 government and judicial restraint. Other than that it 21 tells you nothing. 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let me just tell 23 you something, that the views of limited government 24 and judicial restraint and the number of federalists 25 whom I've encountered in my lifetime lead me to

1	believe that I pretty much know where they're going to
2	land on most issues. So, yes, you and and
3	and I can say the same thing about
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: are members of
5	the Federalist Society.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: anyone in the ACLU.
7	I can say that about people in the American Bar
8	Association. We can sit here all we want and say
9	that, but the fact is people associate with different
-0	groups for various reasons. They wish to do so
11	because the association is in itself part of who and
L2	what they are.
L3	So, yes. I mean, fine. You know, pile in
4	all of the federalists and Cato and everyone else and
L5	AEI and whoever.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We will now have
L7	diversity.
L8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But, you know, at the
L9	end of the day when you have folks whose entire point
20	of view is to oppose civil rights or civil liberties,
21	then I have an issue.
22	And, you know, rather than go into
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And what evidence
24	do you have that any of these people oppose civil
25	rights and civil liberties?

1	COMMISSIONER YARI: Well, I've already
2	given you one about one in Connecticut, and I'm sure
3	if I did a lot of extra research, which I don't have
4	the time to do nor an assistant to do, on some of the
5	new nominees, I could come up with writings. But I
6	can tell you for sure that when it comes to
7	California, I've got a lot of stuff on a lot of the
8	people there, and I will bring it up, each and every
9	one.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And that's fine,
11	but I just
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: you will come
13	loaded for bear for that discussion, I am sure
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just want to say
15	that, you know
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I can't sit here and
17	want to, nor would I be, you know, for all of these
18	different states. I agree with Commissioner Melendez.
19	I think there is a process issue. I think the issue
20	of
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We have a process.
22	You just don't like it.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yeah, pretty much.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But don't say, you
25	know, you're wondering what the process is and is

Τ	there a process and there doesn't seem to be a
2	process
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no, no.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There's a process.
5	We voted for it.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, that's not true.
7	The process by which the actual members are
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There are
9	criteria.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, there are criteria
11	for the individual members. The process by which the
12	pool is created is what Commissioner Melendez has
13	raised, which I agree with and where I believe the
14	Commission can and should do better. You know, I'm
15	sorry, but the idea that I'm going to come straight
16	back to it the idea that we're rolling through a
17	bunch of SACs today where the ratio of men to women is
18	three to one just doesn't scour for me.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What's the ratio
20	on this Commission?
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I under
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Do you want to
23	resign your seat and let someone else step in?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, because I'm the
25	only Asian.
	I

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki --1 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not going to give 2 that up. 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, but these 4 people bring other things to the table, too, just as 5 you bring your ethnicity to the table. These other 6 7 people may not bring the right sex to the table, but they bring other things. That's the very point. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The bottom line is --10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Let me just say this. 11 If I had the appointment power, it would be a lot 12 different. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- that after our 14 process, in my view it is going to result in SACs that 15 have a greater amount of diversity in terms of 16 Just doing a before and after picture, viewpoint. what did the world look like before these SACs were 17 reconstituted and now? 18 And I think that it is clear that these 19 20 SACs will have viewpoints that you may not like, but 21 ar shared by many Americans, and so we will be able to 22 engage in fully fleshed out debates, and I think 23 that's a good thing. 24 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I just 25 want an answer to my question. During the course of

1	the selection of SAC members, was anyone rejected or,
2	in contrast, was anyone placed onto the SAC on the
3	basis of race, sex, national original, color,
4	disability or other
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I want to know, too.
6	MR. MARCUS: Certainly, to the best of my
7	knowledge, no. I Have to say there is one candidate
8	who is on this who I recommended who I thought was an
9	African America and later found out and I don't
10	recall exactly why I had that impression.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is that the guy
12	from Steinfeld?
13	MR. MARCUS: Pardon?
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is that the guy
15	from Steinfeld?
16	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: There are no African
17	Americans on Steinfeld.
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I mean the guy who
19	Elaine was dating that she felt was African American
20	and then he thought she was Hispanic and
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, he thought
22	Elaine was Hispanic?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The conversation is
25	degenerating.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It is, but you 1 2 know. MR. MARCUS: He later found out he was 3 white --4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you aware --5 6 MR. MARCUS: -- but, of course, couldn't 7 make a changed my mind based on that. So to the best of my knowledge, no one was either excluded or 8 9 included on any of those bases. 10 did reach out of to а number 11 organizations that have particular connections 12 either gender orrace ordifferent sorts 13 We reached out, for instance, to the . constituencies. 14 League of Women Voters and La Raza, the Southern 15 Christian Leadership Conference, the NAACP, the Martin 16 Luther King Center, the Jimmy Carter Center, the 17 African Literacy Program and, yes, the Federalist 18 Society and the Georgia Public Policy Institute as 19 well as several colleges. 20 PARTICIPANT: So you had outreach. There 21 was no discrimination on the basis of any of the 22 immutable characteristics that I mentioned, and this 23 is what we came up with. 24 MR. MARCUS: that's right.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ:

25

I just had a

1.	comment in maybe closing the comments, but I think
2	that maybe our outreach needs to be enhanced to
3	some you know, I think when I look at it, I had
4	even the Native Americans asking me how do you get on
5	Civil Rights, even the State Advisory committee, and
6	I really didn't have an answer for that because I was
7	kind of worrying about the process.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Just give me the
9	names.
1.0	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Submit the names.
11	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yeah, but see, I
12	think the outreach needs to be if that's part of our
13	strategic goals, is to outreach to enhancing State
14	Advisory Boards. I think that maybe more work has to
15	be done there.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, looking at the
17	organizations that he just rattled off, it appears as
18	if it was a wide net that was cast and we can always
19	do a better job. So when we start our process, if any
20	Commissioner had an organization that they want to
21	insure is considered or reached to, by all means,
22	contact the Staff Director.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, what I
24	would request of the Staff Director is that I would
25	like a list of those SACs for which there is currently

1 undergoing outreach for new members, and I would also like the cutoff dates by which those applications 2 3 should be applied, and if there are any currently in the process of being reviewed that is not too 4 5 untimely, I'd like the opportunity to see whether or 6 not names could be suggested for them. 7 But part of the issue, quite frankly, is not just her, give me a name, throw me a name, 8 9 whatever a name is. Let me just reiterate. 10 part time. I have no assistant. We all have our own work to do. It would help focus efforts a lot better 11 12 if I knew that in two months Washington or -- no, we 13 did Tennessee -- you know, or whatever is coming up . 14 down the pipeline. These are the deadlines, blah, 15 blah, blah. That would help focus attention on that better than sort of a scattered shot. Well, who do I 16 17 know and whatever, whatever, whatever? 18 Well, may I suggest this, MR. MARCUS: 19 Commissioner Yaki? There are a number where it's 20 imminent, where it's sort of too close because we've 21 already been working very --22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Who are they? 23 MR. MARCUS: But for -- who are they? 24 ` COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.

MR. MARCUS:

25

The ones that were really

1	close, of course, California is on the table.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't think you're
3	close at all on that one.
4	MR. MARCUS: I think we're very close with
5	Virginia, with Maryland, with Arizona. I hope we're
6	close with Wyoming. Those are the ones we're very
7	close.
8	And when I say "very close," once we have
9	a name, it can take many months in order to get the
10	paper work done. So those ones are very close, but
11	the ones that we're not quite that close where it
12	would be great to get additional names would be ones
13	like
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, rather than say
15	it, I think an E-mail would be great to go out with
16	the deadlines because that would make it a lot easier.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yeah, and we wouldn't
18	have to
19	MR. MARCUS: That's fine.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yeah, I think that
21	that's a good idea.
22	Are we ready to vote on the Georgia SAC?
23	All in favor of the motion, please say aye.
24	(Chorus of ayes.)
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Objections?

1	Abstentions?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, objections? You
3	mean no votes? No.
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I abstain.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm voting no.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So let the
7	record reflect that
8	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: He obtained.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, you or
10	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: He obtained.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Please let the
12	record reflect that Commissioner Melendez abstained.
13	Commissioner Yaki votes against the Georgia slate.
14	The motion carries.
15	Next up is the recharter package for the
16	Illinois SAC. May I have a motion to recharter the
17	Illinois State Advisory Committee?
18	. Under this motion the committee appoints
19	the follow individuals to that committee based on the
20	recommendations of the Staff Director:
21	Barbara Abrajano
22	Nancy Adrade
23	David Baker
24	Martin Castro
25	Sonny Chico

1	Yvonne Coleman
2	Louis Goldstein
3	Sandra Jackson
4	This is a challenge. Ultra Mandrite
5	(phonetic) Demetri Kantzavelos
6	Herbert Morton
7	John Mauck
8	Cameron Memon
9	Gordon Quinn
10	Cynthia Shawamreh
11	Betsy Shuman-Moore
12	Anthony Sisneros
13	Lee Walker
14	And Farhan Younus
15	With this motion, the Commission appoints
16	Lee Walker as the chair of the newly rechartered
17	Illinois State Advisory Committee. These members will
18	serve as uncompensated government employees, and the
19	Commission appreciates the hard work that they will no
20	doubt contribute assuming that this motion passes.
21	Under this motion, the Commission
22	authorizes the Staff Director to execute the
23	appropriate paper work for the appointment.
24	Anyone in support of this motion?
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I have a question.
	I and the second se

1	Do you need a second before we discuss?
2	PARTICIPANT: So moved.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I would prefer and
4	is there a second?
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, again, along
8	the same lines of what we're talking about, I believe
9	that the regional staff person had recommended Mr.
10	Castro, you know, within that region, and I believe
11	Mr. Marcus had basically decided on Mr. Walker, who is
12	a Republican. So I'm just saying the whole issue just
13	seems to be along party lines as far as stacking some
14	of these, and that's a good example of where from the
15	bottom up you will get a recommendation. Unless you
16	have a valid reason why
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How as it stacked?
18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I mean, I'm just
19	saying
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What's the ratio of
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The chairman has
22	to be from one part or the other. So is it stacked
23	either way?
24	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: But I'm just
25	saying, well, give us a good reason why the

1	recommendation coming from the region you would
2	think that unless you know him better than the
3	regional person who is in that area
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I do. He's my
5	pick. I know Lee Walker for quite a long time. He's
6	been involved in the civil rights movement for a long
7	time. He marched with Abernathy and company. He runs
8	a coalition out of Chicago. He's a big supporter of
9	school choice.
10	I think that he would be a fantastic
11	chairman, and that's why I recommended him.
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: So what
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The imbalanced
14	chair
15	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: So what would be
16	wrong with Mr. Castro then? Do you have to basically
17	come up with why wouldn't you go with the
18	recommendation of their regional director in that
19	area?
20	MR. MARCUS: May I address that?
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Sure.
<b>2</b> 2	MR. MARCUS: I got the packet from the
23	regional director which had various recommendations,
24	including Mr. Castro for chair. I looked at all of
25	the different recommendations, and considering each

potential person for chair as well as Mr. Castro. Given that Mr. Castro was the recommendation of the director, he was sort of the first person I looked at, but I also wanted to look at others.

I asked the regional director for the reasons why he rather than anyone else, and one of the leading recommendations was that it was because it was a Commissioner recommendation. Because Commissioner Braceras had mentioned him, that sort of gave him an advantage, and there were one or two other things that she mentioned also.

Walker was someone who I knew also had

Commissioner recommendation, although that

Commissioner recommendation might not have been known

to the regional director.

I called both of them. I called both Castro and Walked, and I had several days before the mail-out to get a response and to talk to both of them. Walker I was able to talk to and had a very good conversation. I knew a little bit of his background. I had the recommendation from the Chair and from my discussion of him and what I had seen from others and talking to the regional director, he seemed to have the level of commitment and energy to be a very good chair.

Mr. Castro did not return my phone call during that period. Now, I later heard that he was on travel, and he more recently returned my call, and so now we're playing phone tag, but the main reason that I wasn't able to go with him was that I wasn't able to communicate with him.

One thing I find with State Advisory Committees is that the members are often difficult to contact, just as Commissioners are, because they have other jobs, and so I try to be persistent in trying to reach people.

On the other hand, all else being equal, the ability to reach someone who is supposed to be the eyes and ears in the Commission certainly weighs in favor of them. So that together with the different, very positive things that I had been hearing from Mr. Walker sort of weighed in favor of Mr. Walker.

But I would want to emphasize that I've heard only good things about Mr. Castro as well, and hope that he continues to serve as a valued member of the committee.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, with all due respect, Marti Castro is fabulous, and he was my recommendation for the SAC, and had he been selected as chair, I'd be thrilled with that. But I'm willing

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to defer to the Staff Director's discretion, and if 1 both of these individuals are good people for the 2 post, then as between the two, the Staff Director's 3 decision that accessibility -- I'm sorry? 4 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Nothing. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Just a shot. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What did he say? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, no, nothing. Just 8 9 he's a Republican.. COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I said, "Pick the 10 11 Republican." CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: "Pick the Republican." 12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The bottom line is 13 14 I would have been happy either way, and I'm willing to leave that decision to the Staff Director. 15 I would 16 have been thrilled to see Marti Castro as chair, but 17 I'm not going to oppose it just because --18 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Right, and I don't 19 have a problem with the authority of the Staff 20 Director being the final say, you know what I mean? 21 But what I'm saying is as you know, when we first 22 started discussing the SACs and I also recommended 23 that we kind of include that in the strategic plan, 24 and you also know what was said about us, and it 25 almost sounds like they were saying that they're kind

recommendation.

of left out, that their decisions don't mean anything, 1 and it probably goes to the regional officers, too. 2 I'm just saying that at some point we 3 might want to, wherever they make the recommendation, 4 5 we might want support that to Otherwise if we keep overriding that recommendation, 6 7 then we'll probably get more letters from people saying that this is a top-down, do as we say, and we 8 9 don't care about what the SACs say or what the 10 regional directors say. 11 12

That's my only point, and you know, even though we brought these up as certain issues, I just want us to be aware of that whole bigger picture as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think it is important that we entertain seriously the suggestions by all the folks involved in the process, but if you're suggesting that these decisions be made by either the current or former members of SACs or the folks in regional offices, then I'd have to disagree with you.

I think that the ultimate decision is ours and that we rely heavily on the judgment of the Staff I think that that process does not Director, and eliminate input from current and former members of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	SACs or the regional offices.
2	Commissioner Yaki.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Using a value
4	neutral approach to this, given the fact that this is
5	a very active state with what presumably hopefully
6	will be a very active SAC, I think that having some
7	continuity in leadership would be important, and I am
8	going to make a substitute motion to nominate Mr.
9	Castro as the Chair of the Illinois SAC.
10	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I would second
11	that motion.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Do we know that
13	he's interested?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Presumably he
15	MR. MARCUS: I believe he is. I believe
16	that he would not I believe that he is interested.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Presumably he would
18	not have been submitted by others if he had not given
19	an indication that he would have.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Conversation.
21	Mr. Castro, is he currently on the SAC?
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Un-huh.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, he is.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, I'm
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	indifferent, honestly, except that I don't necessarily
2	feel that we should be disrupting, you know, the
3	discretion of the Staff Director, but
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well /
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm a big fan
6	of Marti Castro. I gave \$400 to his congressional
7	campaign. You're not going to see a fight from me if
8	he becomes the chair.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I would say that we
10	just vote on the motion as the original motion. I see
11	no reason to undo the choice made by the Staff
12	Director. There will be many instances where there
13	are multiple strong candidates and a decision is made.
14	Unless we can find some type of flaw in the Staff
15	Director's process or some type of animus, then I
16	think that we should just at least I would
17	recommend that we defer.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Point of order.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think the
20	process is that we vote on a substitute motion.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right. Point of
22	order. The substitute motion takes precedence over
23	the main motion.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I was going to
l	

address the substitute motion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: And what I was saying, the issue is there has to be some give and take on this Commission, you know, and this might be one of the give-and-takes because if for some reason -- and we could lose the vote on this, but what you'll see is like Commissioner Yaki said. I don't have time to get involved with every one of these SACs, but if we are not happy and there is no compromise or no give and take on here, then what you'll see is we'll really get into these SACs and every one of these we come up, we'll focus off of whatever else there is, and we'll start to put more effort into really scrutinizing every one of these, and that's where we're actually going.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that that's each Commissioner's prerogative. If you'd like to spend a lot of time pouring over each of the candidates, I think it would probably be a good thing. The more information the better.

And in terms of compromise, this Commission has, I think, bent over backwards to try to meet, to try to respond to all dissenting views.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

We've always tried to -- all on a regular basis, we 1 2 try to come up with compromises. What we don't do is just say, 3 vote." We work at trying to find compromises. 4 of the time we're successful. Some of the time we're 5 6 not. So --7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would agree. COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Let me ask what 8 9 does Staff Director's -- what do you think about 10 changing to Mr. Castro as far as could it go either 11 way as far as you're concerned or you still -- because 12 it sounds like it's the Chairman that's basically 13 recommending. Maybe you thought about Mr. Castor. 14 Maybe it's the Chairman that's basically pushing you 15 to change your mind and go in a different direction. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Push you? Did I twist 17 your arm? 18 MR. MARCUS: Walker No. Mr. is 19 recommendation and he is My enthusiastic 20 recommendation. I've heard and read very positive 21 things about him. He really seems to be a leader in 22 his community. He's very well regarded. 23 very active in a number of issues related to civil 24 I think he's going to be tremendous. rights. 25

Castro I've also only heard good

1	things about. I think either one of them would be
2	great. I think we are very fortunate that both
3	gentlemen are willing to serve and serve without
4	compensation in the relatively taskless job. If I had
5	had an opportunity to speak with Mr. Castro, if he
6	hadn't been traveling as part of his busy law
7	practice, I really don't know. I mean he might have
8	impressed me every bit as favorably as Mr. Walker, but
9	it's hypothetical at this point.
10	So I would say I enthusiastically
11	recommend Mr. Walker, but I've heard only good things
12	about Mr. Castro.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor.
14	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: This is a process
15	that I think requires some level of deference to the
16	Staff Director. I would differ in the Chair in the
17	sense that I don't feel bound and limited by the need
18	to have a member of this Commission identify a flaw in
19	the Staff Director's logic in order for me not to
20	defer to him.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's fair. I agree.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Frankly, sometimes
23	there may be calls that we make where Commissioner
24	Yaki makes a recommendation, for example, or asks a
25	position, and I in the interest of maintaining the

collegial nature of this body agree with.

Having said all of that, I'm going to vote against the substitute motion because of the Chair's involvement with this individual and his desire to see him serve as chair. You know, absent that personal involvement, I'd be more inclined, frankly, to go with Commissioner Yaki's recommendation, but given the Chair's personal involvement, I'm going to vote against it.

I want to put another caution, if I could, however. Commissioner Melendez indicated that he was concerned that there would be an effort to stack these, and I don't think that's true in any respect. The process is open, and again, but for the personal involvement of the Chair, I'd be inclined to support Commissioner Yaki's motion, but I can't for that reason.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I concur in large part with comments made by Commissioner Taylor. I'm encouraged, actually by the process as described by Commissioner Braceras, the Chair, and the Staff Director as to how we arrived at the recommended motion pertaining to Mr. Walker.

We had a Republican Commissioner who had

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

recommended a Democratic chair. The Staff Director vetted the two, made a diligent effort to make sure that he received comments from both of them, and possibly because of time constraints couldn't receive sufficient input to make a determination with respect to Mr. Castro.

Mr. Walker doesn't seem to have any deficiencies or defects that would disqualify him from this process. So I think this has been a process that was fair and open, transparent, and I'm also inclined to vote against the substitute motion because I don't defer to the Staff Director, but I think he has spent a lot more time on this issue than I have, and I don't know anything about Mr. Castro other than what I have just heard here today and what's in the materials.

And clearly, the Staff Director has spent more time on this than I have.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Two comments. When I recommended Mr. Walker, I assumed that he was a Democrat, and he marched with King and Abernathy, and from that generation most of the black leaders were Democrats. My assumption turned out to be wrong.

And as for Mr. Castro, he is imminently qualified to be the chairman of that SAC, and in fact, if he is still on the SAC and interested in the job

1 the next go-round, my presumption is he will have my 2 vote. 3 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would call the 4 question. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Point of information. 7 On SACs are there chairs and vice chairs or is it just 8 chair? 9 Typically we have chairs. MR. MARCUS: 10 Vice chair is not a typical designation. I can't say 11 we don't have any in the 51, but typically we have a 12 chair. 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, what happens, 14 for example, when a chair is unable to fulfill his or 15 her duties? 16 MR. MARCUS: Well, that's a good question. 17 The process is to name an acting chair. For instance, 18 there was a motion to name an acting chair in Maine a 19 couple of months ago. 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would just say 21 listening to the Chairman and his strong feelings about Mr. Walker, I'm inclined to withdraw my motion, 22 23 but I would suggest that perhaps in this instance 24 where we have two people very qualified, 25 interested, perhaps we can in this instance create the

1	chair/vice chair category so that they can both
2	function at a high level and hopefully working with
3	each other, and I would ask that we create a chair and
4	vice chair position in the State of Illinois, with the
5	chair being Mr. Walker and the vice chair being Mr.
.6	Castro.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Second?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm not opposed to
9	that. I'm sorry if there's any discussion. I just
10	don't know if that's kind or presumptuous of us. You
11	know, it may be that Mr. Castro would see that as a
12	demotion or an insult. I don't know. We haven't
13	contacted him.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we can do it
15	contingent upon a conversation with him.
16	Comments? How does everyone feel about
17	this?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'm comfortable
20	with the motion and will support it. So let's vote on
21	the where are we now?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Amended Yaki
23	substitute motion.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. The
25	amended Yaki substitute motion.
ſ	I and the second

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Could we restate
2	it?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That we accept the
4	recommendation of the Staff Director for Lee Walker to
5	be named as Chair; that we direct the Staff Director
6	to ask Mr. Castro if he would be willing to serve as
7	vice chair of the Illinois SAC and if so, would you
8	create that position, and entitle them there
9	forthwith.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor? I'm
11	sorry.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have a
14	second here. We've already had our discussion. We
15	get to vote now. All in favor, please say aye.
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any dissent,
18	objections, abstentions?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That motion
21	passes.
22	However, it was not clear
23	PARTICIPANT: We still have the slate
24	portion.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that's right.

1	It's finished with the slate. Okay. Now, let's vote
2	on the remaining recommendations. Do we need
3	additional discussion?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor?
6	(Chorus of ayes.)
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Objections?
8	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Abstain.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Please let the
10	record reflect that with the exception of Commissioner
11	Melendez, all Commissioners present voted for the
12	motion. The motion carries.
13	We'll take a five-minute break.
14	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Actually I'm
15	sorry. I wanted to abstain on the remainder.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, okay. Please let
17	the record reflect that with the exception of
18	Commissioners Yaki and Melendez, all of the other
19	Commissioners voted in favor. The motion carries.
20	Let's take a five-minute break.
21	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
22	the record at 11:09 a.m. and went back on
23	the record at 11:26 a.m.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's go back on the
25	record.

1	We have the rechartering package for Utah.
2	Commissioners Yaki and Melendez, if there are an
3	insufficient number of blacks on that committee, it's
4	not our fault.
5	May I have a motion that the Commission
6	recharter the Utah State Advisory Committee?
7	Under this motion the Commission appoints
8	the following individuals to that committee based on
9	the recommendations of the Staff Director:
10.	Charlene Arbon
11	Glen Bailey
12	William Coleman
13	Virginius Dabney .
14	Marco Diaz
15	Michael Homer
16	Robyn Kaelin
17	Daniel Levin
18	Edward Lewis
19	Joan Milner
20	Rosa Maria Martinez
21	David Parker
22	Betty Sawyer
23	Filia Uipi
24	Robert Whitehorse
25	And Jennifer Yim.

1	With this motion, the Commission appoints
2	Mr. Uipi as chair of the newly rechartered Utah State
3	Advisory Commission. These members will serve as
4	uncompensated government employees, and the Commission
5	appreciates your hard work, assuming that this motion
6	passes, that they will contribute.
7	Under the motion the Commission authorizes
8	the Staff Director to execute the appropriate paper
9	work for the appointment.
10	Does anybody want to hand me this motion?
11	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm just going to say
15	the same objections as before.
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I would ask the
17	Staff Director how this dialogue went with the
18	regional director.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I had no input into
20	this one. I don't know many people from Utah.
21	MR. MARCUS: I'm sorry, Commissioner. How
22	did my conversation
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: How did that one
24	go as compared to the others as far as the Utah?
25	MR. MARCUS: In this one, we reached out

1 to a number of organizations, including the Utah Governor's Office, the State Foreign Commission's 2 Office, the University of Utah, at least one or two 3 4 members of Congress, the NAACP, the Asian Association of Utah, the Utah Rasa Political Action Committee. We 5 reached out to a number of different groups and have 6 7 what I think is a fairly diverse, balanced group in a 8 number of respects. 9 The regional director's recommendations 10 looked pretty good to me. I made a number of efforts 11 to reach out and identify candidates to see whether I 12 was coming up with the same one as the regional 13 directors were coming up with with different ones. 14 In the State of Utah, I frankly did not 15 come up with very much, certainly different than the 16 regional directors, and I know he was working on it 17 very hard. Fortunately we were able, since this was 18 at the end of the fiscal year and we had a little 19 extra money, I was able to send the regional director 20 to Salt Lake City to do some recruitment. 21 I think at that point we were a little 22 weak on --23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: You sent him on a 24 mission? 25 MR. MARCUS: -- we were a little weak on

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	lawyers. So he was able to recruit lawyers, and the
2	package basically seemed to be balanced.
3	I looked at all of the candidates, and
4	especially Mr. Uipi. I interviewed Mr. Uipi by phone,
5	had a very good conversation with him. He certainly
6	seemed to be committed to the mission of the SAC.
7	Everything that I heard from him seemed to be very
8	positive, and so I was able to make the
9	recommendations essentially based on what the regional
10	director had suggested.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Additional
12	conversation?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor,
15	please say aye.
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Objections?
18	Abstentions?
19	(Show of hands.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let the record reflect
21	that Commissioner Yaki abstains. The remaining
22	Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. The
23	motion passes.
24	Okay, folks. We are done.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: One thing. I just
	II

1	wanted to acknowledge my former assistant, Chris
2	Jennings, who left the employ of the Commission about
3	a month ago to take a position in Baghdad. The
4	Commission was a bit too stressful for him. He had
5	done tremendous work on my behalf in nearly three
6	years, and he was an extraordinary assistant, assisted
7	me in preparation for testimony and nomination of a
8	couple of Supreme Court Justices before the Senate
9	Judiciary Committees, done yeoman's work, and I shall
10	miss him.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What's he doing in
12	Baghdad?
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: He's assisting
14	with the continued formation of the government.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Who was he
16	employed by?
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I can't remember
18	what the name of the entity is.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is he already
20	there?
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, folks, we
23	will reconvene at one o'clock. Please try to get here
24	on time.
25	The briefing, as you know, will be covered

by C-SPAN, and it would be great if we could start on 1 2 time. (Whereupon, at 11:31 a.m., the meeting was 3 recessed for lunch, to reconvene at 1:00 p.m., the 4 5 same day.) VI. Briefing on Voter Fraud and Voter Intimidation 6 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, folks. Let's get started. 8 9 I guess I start off by welcoming our 10 panelists. I would ask everyone to silence their cell 11 phones. 12 On behalf of the Commission on Civil 13 Rights, I welcome everyone to this briefing on voter . 14 fraud and voter intimidation. The Commission 15 frequently arranges such public briefings 16 presentations from experts outside of the agency in 17 order to inform itself and the nation of civil rights 18 issues. 19 At this briefing a panel of experts will advise the U.S. Commission on Civil Right's on the 20 21 frequent allegations of voter fraud and intimidations 22 that have questioned federal and state elections in 23 recent years. Purported incidents of voter fraud include non-citizens voting, eligible voters casting 24 two or more ballots or impersonating other voters and 25

other types of fraud. 1 intimidations Claims of voter 2 involved officials purportedly challenging voters in 3 minority areas with requests for identification and 4 5 providing incorrect information on voter eligibility. 6 This morning we are pleased to welcome 7 four experts on various aspects of voter fraud and 8 voter intimidation. 9 First, we have Robert Pastor, currently a 10 professor of international relations at American 11 University and former Executive Director of the 12 Carter-Baker Commission, more formally known was the 13 Commission on Federal Election Reform. 14 Second to speak will be Thor Hearne, a 15 member and principal of the law firm of Lathrop & Gage in St. Louis, Missouri. He was the national election 16 17 counsel for the Bush-Chaney ticket in '04, and general 18 counsel to the American Center for Voting Rights. 19 Third will be Donna Brazile, Chair of the 20 Democratic National Committee's Voting Rights 21 Institute and former campaign manager for the Gore-22 Lieberman ticket in 2000. 23 Finally we'll have John Fund of the Wall 24 Street Journal and author of a 2004 book Stealing 25 Elections: How Voter Fraud Threatens our Democracy.

I welcome all of you on behalf of the 1 Commission, and we'll introduce everyone and describe 2 your activities, and then we'll call on you according 3 to the order which I have given for the record. 4 First up we will have Robert Pastor, who 5 has been the Vice President of International Affairs 6 and a professor of international relations at American 7 University since 2002. In addition, Dr. Pastor is the 8 9 Executive Director of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, co-chaired by Jimmy Carter and James 10 11 Baker. 12 From 1985 until he arrived in American 13 University, Dr. Pastor was the professor of political science at Emory University and a fellow and founding 14 15 director of the Carter Center's Latin American and 16 Caribbean Program and the Democracy and China Election 17 Projects. 18 He has held many other prestigious 19 positions in government and academia. He was a Peace 20 Corps volunteer in Malaysia, a Fulbright Scholar in 21 Mexico, Straus Visiting Professor at 22 University, and the creator of the Humphrey Fellows 23 Program. 24 Dr. Pastor is author or editor of 25 books, including Toward a North American Community,

Exiting the Whirlpool, U.S. Foreign Policy Towards 1 Latin America, and others. 2 Second we have Thor Hearne. Thor 3 currently serves as counsel to the American Center for 4 Voting Rights Legislative Fund. Prior to joining the 5 legislative fund, he served as the national election 6 7 chief counsel to President Bush's reelection campaign for 2004 and in 2000, he was the Missouri counsel to 8 9 the Bush campaign. 10 Hearne was served as legal counsel in too 11 many other political candidates and campaigns on the 12 federal and state level. Mr. Hearne testified before 13 the U.S. House Administration Committee hearing in 14 March 2005 regarding the presidential election in 15 Ohio. 16 Hearne also testified before the Mr. 17 Missouri Commission to investigate the 2000 Missouri 18 general election and allegations of fraud in the city 19 of St. Louis. 20 More recently, Mr. Hearne served as an 21 academic advisor to the bipartisan Carter-Baker 22 Commission on Election Reform. Mr. Hearne also served 23 as the attorney and law clerk in the U.S. Department of Education for the Office for Civil Rights during 24 25 the Reagan Administration.

He received his law degree from Washington 1 University Law School and his B.A. from Washington 2 University in St. Louis. 3 Third we'll have Donna Brazile, who is the 4 Chair of the Democratic National Committee's Voting 5 Institute, and an adjunct professor 6 Rights Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. 7 Ms. Brazile is the former campaign manager 8 9 for the presidential election for the Gore-Lieberman 10 ticket in 2000 and the first black American to lead a 11 major presidential campaign. Prior to joining the Gore campaign, Ms. 12 Brazile was Chief of Staff and press secretary to . 13 Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton of the District of 14 15 She is a weekly contributor and political 16 commentator on CNN's Inside Politics and American 17 Morning. 18 In addition she is a columnist for Roll 19 Call Newspaper and appears regularly on MSNBC's Hard 20 Ball and Fox's Hannity & Colmes. A veteran of 21 numerous national and statewide campaigns, Ms. Brazile 22 worked presidential campaigns several for 23 Democratic candidates In addition, Ms. Brazile has served as a 24 25 senior lecturer and adjunct professor the

the America, and director Brazile οf & District of Columbia. 15 16 18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

University of Maryland and a Fellow at Harvard's Institute of Politics. Ms. Brazile is a recipient of numerous awards and honors, including Washingtonian magazine's 100 Most Powerful Women in Washington, D.C., Essence magazine's 50 Most Powerful Women in Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's award for political achievement.

She is currently the founder and managing Associates, a political consulting and grassroots advocacy firm based in the

Finally, we have John Fund, who writes the weekly "On the Trail" column for Opinion.com, for the Journal, and he is author of the 2004 book Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threatens our Democracy.

Mr. Fund joined the Wall Street Journal in april of 1984 as Deputy Editorial Features Editor. became an editorial page write specializing politics and government. In October of 1986 and was a member of the Journal's editorial board from 1995 to Mr. Fund worked as a research analyst for the California State Legislature in Sacramento before beginning his journalism career in 1982 as a reporter for the syndicated columnist Roland Evans and Robert Novak.

1	In 1983, he received the Warren Brooks
2	Award for Journalistic Excellence from the American
3	Legislative Exchange Council. He and former
4	Pennsylvania Representative James Kohn are co-authors
5	of the book <u>Cleaning House: America's Campaign for</u>
6	Term Limits.
7	Mr. Fund attended California State
8	University where he studied journalism and economics.
9	Panelists, thank you very much for carving
10	out this time from your busy schedules. We will start
11	with Professor Pastor.
12	You'll have ten minutes.
13	DR. PASTOR: Thank you very much, Mr.
14	Chairman and members of the Commission. It's an honor
15	to testify before you today on these very important
16	issues of fraud and election and intimidation in the
17	context of broader election reform.
18	For the last 20 years I've worked on
19	improving the electoral process in the United States
20	and throughout the world. At American University we
21	sponsored the Carter-Baker Commission on Federal
22	Election Reform, issued a report with 87 specific
23 .	recommendations as to what is needed to improve our
24	process.

subject of

The

25

today

hearing

your

demonstrates why it is both necessary and difficult to make progress on these reforms. For many Republicans, the principal problem is electoral fraud and for many democrats the issue is voter intimidation and the impediments to voting.

For many Republicans, the solution is voter IDs and for many Democrats voter IDs are the problem, not the solution.

For our commission, which was roughly divided between Republicans, Democrats and independents, we all believe that a free election requires both valid integrity and access, and that voter IDs are a part of the problem -- a part of the solution, but if they become the entire part of the solution, then they actually become the problem.

The other parts to the solution include expanding access through an affirmative role by the states to provide free voter IDs and to expand the base of registered voters to take steps to insure there is no intimidation and also to examine other kinds of election fraud and take steps against them.

Without going into the full recommendations, let me try to summarize the broad approach that the Carter-Baker Commission took. Let me say having observed elections all over the world,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

24

25

I've seen crude efforts to manipulate elections and to intimidate voters on a national scale. Fortunately this does not occur in the United States, and one reason is that our system is so decentralized that it's frankly, impossible to manipulate the electoral system on a nationwide basis. Indeed, it's hard to persuade states and counties to accept uniform requirements that Congress has mandated.

There is some forms and some fraud and intimidation in U.S. elections, änd the some perception may be growing albeit from each group that each problem is getting worse. Any fraud intimidation represent egregious assaults on democracy, and we need to take steps to stop both, but we also need to recognize that we face a wider range of election related problems. We need to, for example, establish nonpartisan, autonomous, professional election administration in our states. It does not exist today.

We need paper audits and electronic security and more accurate and up to date and interoperable registration lists. We need to undertake all of these reforms to build greater confidence in elections.

In our report, we identify numerous

24

25

recommendations, first to improve access to elections through improved registration for our citizens, including Americans with disabilities and those working or serving abroad.

We need to restore voting rights to otherwise eligible citizens who have been convicted of a felony. We need greater voter education so that more people can understand their responsibility to vote and make it easier for them to do so.

With regard to election fraud. our Commission judges that it's, frankly, difficult to measure, but that it occurs. The U.S. Department of Justice has launched more than 180 investigations into election fraud since October 2002. These investigations have resulted in charges of multiple voting, of providing full information on felon status, other offenses as well.

Some cases, of course, are never pursued because the difficulty of obtaining sufficient evidence for prosecution or because many people believe that this is a victimless crime. In truth, election fraud usually attracts public attention and comes under investigation only under very close elections.

We recommend steps that the Department of

Justice should undertake to deal with that.

Absentee ballots remain the largest source of potential voter fraud. Our Commission recommended that state and local jurisdictions should prohibit a person other than voter from handling absentee ballots. The practice of allowing party workers from delivering absentee ballots should be eliminated. States should also make sure that absentee ballots received by election officials before election day are kept secure until they are counted.

The practice of challenges may contribute to ballot integrity, but it can also have the effect of intimidating eligible voters. New procedures are, therefore, needed to protect voters from such intimidating tactics, while also offering opportunities to keep the registration rolls accurate and to provide observers with meaningful opportunities to conduct the elections.

States need to provide and define clear procedures for challenges which should mainly be raised and resolved before the deadline for voter registration.

In addition to the penalties set by the Voting Rights Act, it should be a federal felony to engage in any act of violence, property destruction or

threat that is intended to deny any individual the right to vote. To deter systemic efforts to deceive or intimidate voters, the Commission recommended federal legislation to prohibit any individual or group from deliberately providing the public with incorrect information about election procedures for the purpose of preventing voters from going to the polls.

A good registration list will insure that citizens are only registered in one place, but election officials need to make sure that the person arriving at a polling site is the same one that is named on the registration list.

In the United States where 40 million people move each year, we believe that some form of identification is needed. We were concerned, however, over the expanding and proliferation of voter ID requirements and believe that this could be the source of discrimination.

Therefore, we recommended a single uniform ID which used the real ID card as the basis for doing that, which also requires proof of citizenship or lawful status. But it's also essential for the states to play an affirmative role to insure that those people who do not have a driver's license have access

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to a free photo ID, and indeed, that mobile offices at 1 a much more enhanced role by states is undertake so 2 that we use the real ID as an opportunity to expand 3 voter registration lists and, therefore, expand voter 4 5 participation. We believe that this is possible, but it 6 7 requires an affirmative role by the state. 8 To verify the identity of voters who cast 9 absentee ballots, the voter's signature on the 10 absentee ballot can be matched with a digitalized 11 the election version of the signature that 12 administration maintains. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Two minutes. You have 14 two minutes remaining. 15 DR. PASTOR: Thank you. I'm jüst about 16 there. 17 There are also concerns that IDs might be 18 a step towards a police state, but the truth is most 19 advanced democracies have national identification 20 cards. Still, nonetheless, recommend we 21 institutional and procedural safeguards, including 22 ombudsmen to assure people that their privacy, 23 security and identity will not be compromised by ID 24 cards. The cards should not become instruments for 25 monitoring behavior.

1	In conclusion, fraud and intimidation of
2	any kind and magnitude is unacceptable in a free
3	electoral process, and if the perception is growing
4	that both are getting worse, then additional
5	safeguards are absolutely essential.
6	The Carter-Baker Commission offered dozens
7	of recommendations to address the two issues, as well
8	as others that confront the full gamut of problems
9	facing the U.S. electoral process, including the need
10	to establish nonpartisan, professional, and autonomous
11	election systems in each state and oversight over the
12	source codes and verifiable paper audits for
13	electronic machines.
14	To implement these goals requires that
15	party leaders in each legislative body recognize that
16	access and integrity are two sides of the same
17	problem, and both need to be protected.
18	Thank you, sir.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
20	Mr. Hearne.
21	MR. HEARNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22	It is truly an honor to be here, as Mr.
23	Pastor mentioned, Professor Pastor mentioned, and I
24	appreciate being invited.
25	I also am very grateful that this

Commission is looking into this at a time when our nation is on the cusp of a midterm election. Our national attention is focused on elections, how we are going to conduct our elections.

Let me note Bob Pastor mentioned the Carter-Baker report. I had the honor of being one of the many academic advisors that assisted in that effort, and that was, I consider, a high point in the process of developing bipartisan consensus on election reform.

Bob Pastor himself really labored heavily on that project, as did many others, and I would commend that in my recommendation to this Commission as being very thoughtful consensus of bipartisan recommendation from various leaders, including folks such as Andrew Young, Lee Hamilton, President Carter, Secretary of State Baker, and many others who shared and participated in that work. It is an outstanding product, and it is one that I think, again, has some recommendations that are of very significant value to this Commission.

But as a Commission, the Carter-Baker Commission noted, as anyone who is looking at recent polls can see, we have a situation in this country where there is a confidence problem in our elections.

Most voters do not have confidence or a significant number of voters do not have confidence that their vote will be fairly and accurately counted, that they will have a fair and accurate opportunity to participate in the election, and that lack of confidence translates into a lower participation by voters.

And both of those, confidence and participation, are features that we think, I think should be addressed and I appreciate, again, this Commission doing that.

Let me address -- and I will not read my prepared remarks since I presented those to the Commission. I will spare you from that and just simply hit a few high points that I noted that I believe are particularly compelling, as one who has been in the election area, in the election law practice for some time.

Specifically, the most important initial step and HAVA, the Help American Vote Act, took significant strides in this direction, is a current inaccurate voter roll. The most likely reason an eligible citizen will be denied their opportunity to cast a ballot is when they go into their polling place, they find that their name is not on the voter

roll. An error in the voter roll, however it gets in there, can deny or disenfranchise a legitimate voter from casting a ballot.

Voter rolls in my home State of Missouri, right now the Department of Justice is suing our state because we have voter rolls that in some cases have 150 percent of the voting age population listed on the voter roll. Clearly it is not an accurate voter roll.

Just this Monday in Missouri we find the St. Louis Post Dispatch front page story was the suspect voter registration cards, thousands of registration cards, fraudulent registration cards submitted to the City of St. Louis Election Board.

Yesterday or day before the <u>Kansas City</u>

<u>Star</u> ran a headline where thousands of fraudulent registration forms were submitted in Kansas City. In 2004, we had a situation where a fellow named Chad Staton was paid in crack cocaine to submit fraudulent voter registration cards in Defiance County, Ohio. Those registration cards included ones for Dick Tracy and Mary Poppins.

Whether somebody does or doesn't cast a ballot in the name of those fraudulent registrations, that entire process undermines our public confidence.

When you read the paper and you see that thousands of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

fraudulent registrations are submitted, when you see that the election is administered in a way where we don't know if the voter rolls are accurate, our citizens are losing confidence in the process.

Carter-Baker recommendations go a long way to addressing that and having some very sound policies that states in the federal government should adopt, but as I said, a current, accurate, single statewide voter roll this year in '06 is the first year that HAVA has that requirement, and hopefully, we will go a long way to doing that.

Making sure that state election officials properly fund that so every eligible, registered, legitimate voter has their name appear properly on the voter role is a good thing. Taking steps to prevent people from trying to game the system with fraudulent registration forms is also a good step and recommendation to prevent people from doing that.

Both Democrat and Republican election officials testified in the aftermath of Ohio in '04 that what they found was large numbers of fraudulent registration forms were dumped on them right at the deadline, and that had the following effect. it more difficult for them to process those registration forms accurately. It also potentially prevented some of them from being added to the voter role in a timely manner.

I think voter registration forms, as the Commission recommended, should Carter-Baker be submitted within several days after they are collected, maybe seven days to ten days. that we will have less likelihood of a registered eligible voter being denied the opportunity to be accurately added to the voter roll. It will also allow election officials to do their job more accurately.

Bob Pastor mentioned the issue of voter identification. I understand that that's а. contentious issue in the country right now, but it shouldn't be, and I regret that in some cases it has become one. I think the Carter-Baker recommendation had a sound recommendation. Let's transition into a government reliably issued photo identification. use that to rent a video, to get on a plane to cash a check. It has become a ubiquitous feature of our life today to have that kind of identification.

Every poll ranges between 80 percent and 90 percent of the public support that kind of confidence building measure. Now, we need to be very mindful that we should not impose a requirement if we

#### NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do not provide the means for everyone to meet that requirement to vote, which means that that card which specifies citizenship and identity of a voter also has protections to make sure they get access to them, have ready access to them, the free photo ID, and that it is without any charge to anyone seeking to obtain that in order to vote.

What you will find is some bipartisan consensus united on the need for photo identification, and in perspective the that I've had, the conversations that I have had with those who support that, Republican, Democrat, civil rights leaders as well, is they see a photo identification card as a means to increase participation. In fact, there has been a study by the economist John Watt that found that when you have greater confidence in the election process, you have greater participation.

And specifically, while not looking at photo ID, but looking at voter identification provisions, what Professor Lott found was you actually had greater participation by voters when you had a new identification requirement those the participation before, and that study is attached to my testimony to this Commission. That is the kind of common sense measure I think we need to support.

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Again, we need to do it in a way that 1 makes sure everybody has access to that, that when we 2 do it that way, it should increase confidence. 3 There some voters who seek to 4 are 5 participate in the election who don't, who choose not 6 to because they fear when they go in somebody will 7 recognize their name. Maybe they have an unusual 8 name. Maybe it's not a common name. Maybe they rear 9 somebody doesn't recognize their signature. 10 If you give these voters a card with their 11 picture on it and say you go into the polling place, 12 you present this card to the election officials, and 13 this will guarantee your right to cast a ballot, that 14 increases participation. That increases confidence, 15 and that's something that should enjoy bipartisan 16 support. 17 I also note, as in Donna's prepared 18 remarks, she said the same point, that --19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Two minutes remain, 20 sir. 21 MR. HEARNE: Thank you. 22 that increased confidence 23 increased participation. So I think that should be 24 our theme that we seek to embrace. 25 Finally I will just note some other

specific recommendations in terms of the administration. I share many of the points that were mentioned by other panelists in their prepared testimony, but the need to have confidence in our election technology, our voting machines, how the votes are tabulated, we need to have provisions in place so that we don't have arbitrary decisions of election officials determining the outcome.

Voters should believe at the end of the election that they were the ones who decided the outcome; that this was not decided by judges and lawyers or election officials acting in an arbitrary manner. We need to have clear, consistent, uniform rules for the conduct of our election throughout the process.

Some states have taken -- and I will note two, Missouri being one with their Voter Protection Act, sweeping election reform in the State of Missouri modeled on Carter-Baker recommendations. A similar state, Pennsylvania, signed by Governor Rendell, the Pennsylvania Voter Accessibility Act. Move polling places out of locations in homes where previously in Philadelphia they had polling places in people's basements or locations where they could not readily vote. That changed under the Pennsylvania law.

### NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

That's the kind of broad, bipartisan 1 election reform that I would recommend to this 2 3 Commission to consider for their recommendations. 4 Thank you very much. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. 6 Ms. Brazile. 7 MS. BRAZILE: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. 8 9 I had to put a smile on my face when Thor 10 mentioned some voter polling places in the basement. 11 Before Katrina the polling place at my home in New Orleans was in our basement, and it's no longer there. 12 13 So I just wanted to let you know a natural disaster . 14 solved that problem. 15 But, Mr. Chairman, members Commission, I'm honored to be here. I have spent my 16 17 entire adult life starting at the age of nine going 18 door to door trying to encourage the participation of 19 all citizens to be engaged in the electoral process, 20 to register, to participate. 21 I started long before I turned 18, quite 22. frankly, because I was excited about the prospects 23 that one candidate in my community had promised to - 24 build a playground, and here I was, a young kid that 25 enjoyed athletics and sports, and when I had the

opportunity to go door knocking encouraging friends, their parents and others to sign up, I felt it was my civic obligation and duty to get people involved.

We won that election, and we got our playground, and at the age of 12 I became an assistant I've been hooked on politics ever since. coach.

But clearly, in my lifetime I have seen barriers come down. I have seen new barrier come up to voter participation by ordinary citizens. The barriers that came down were perhaps the barriers that took the longest to come down, the barriers that prevented people because of their race, because of . their age, from voting.

The barriers that are still erected, sometimes invisible barriers today, are the barriers for ordinary citizens to even find out about how to get involved, how to register, and of course, the barriers now that when most voters go to the polling booth, they find people there who are somehow or another paid by political operatives to tell them that this is not election day. Election day is another day, or if they hadn't paid their parking fines or their child support payment, perhaps they should turn around and come back another day.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

On election day in 2000, I was in Florida 1 with my former boss, the candidate for the Democratic 2 3 nominee, Al Gore, and as my practice on election day, 4 I'm often on radio stations across the country encouraging people to go out and vote. 5 Now, that morning I'll never forget it as 6 7 long as I live. I heard citizens call into various stations saying, "My polling site is not open," or, "I 8 9 attempted to go to my polling station and my name has 10 been inadvertently removed. I voted in the primary 11 several months ago, but no my name is not there. What 12 should I do?" And of course, later that morning I heard . 13 14 from my own sister who resided in the State of Florida, and she asked me, "How many forms of ID do I 15 16 need to vote?" 17 Here it is, my sister. I'm one of nine 18 kids, number seven, and she said, "Donna, I have my 19 voter registration card. I have my driver's license, 20 and yet they said my name is not there. I have to 21 produce another ID." 22 Well, my sister had to produce a third ID, 23 which was a utility bill. 24 Mr. Chairman, members of this committee, 25 it is my experience as somebody who has worked on

campaigns at all levels in our country that the barriers should not exist. The barriers to citizen participation should not be erected just for partisan gain, and what I've seen over the years is barriers erected for one particular candidate, one particular party to try to suppress the vote, to encourage people not to turn out, to threaten them and to use other forms of intimidation. I understand that there's a great concern about number of perhaps ineligible citizens who show up at the polls on election day, and there are many of them, I'm sure, who think that for some reason they were registered and just show up.

But we know that it's all too common in our democracy that certain individuals are showing up.

But we know that it's all too common in our democracy that certain individuals are showing up with the best of intentions to try to participate, and in other cases they were told that once they filled out a form and showed their ID when they registered, that everything was fine and they trusted some citizen or some nonpartisan organizations to submit their forms on time.

But they did not expect in the case that we learned in 2004 in Ohio; they didn't expect that once they showed up that the machines would be inoperable or worse, that they would have to stand in line up to five hours in some cases in Kenyon College

ten hours in order to vote.

I submitted my testimony for the record. Following the 2004 election, I was quite concerned. I didn't want to go through another election cycle where I heard the complaints from ordinary people about whether or not the machines would work, whether or not the poll workers would be trained, whether or not they would be stopped before election day.

And so we undertook a study at the Democratic National Committee's Voting Rights Institute to find out what exactly happened. We wanted to not just hear from some of the experts or the partisans. We wanted to hear from the people themselves.

And so in the weeks following the election, we went out and tried to get from those who were actually on the ground what had happened on election day. We conducted a comprehensive study to determine the accuracy, the validity, and the problems surrounding the 2004 election. Simply, we wanted to know what happened. What was the experience of voters when they went to cast their ballots?

Ohio may have experienced the most extreme and widespread problems. It can be viewed as a microcosm for several battleground states. The types

### NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of problems reported in Ohio were reported in other 1 states, but of course, as many of you know, 2 battleground states we have mortals problems. 3 I can give other examples of 4 mentioned Missouri. states where citizens experience confusing problems at 5 the ballot box, being removed from the polling 6 7 station, having them show ID when, in fact, in many states there is no requirement to show ID once they 8 9 have voted, however, even maintains that once you have 10 shown your ID to vote, you didn't have to show it 11 again.

And yet it was disturbing to find out that many African Americans had to produce ID when the law did not stipulate unless they were first time voters.

All of this is in the report by the Democratic National Committee's Voting Rights Institute, along with the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, the House Democratic Caucus, which also conducted a study on some of the problems that they found in Ohio and elsewhere.

But before we try to address the issue of voter fraud, which I do believe and I condemn it every day of my life, let us commit to a policy of voting as civil rights for all citizens of the United States and design and implement policies that further that right

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and goal without erecting more barriers that could 1 substantially dilute the participation of Americans. 2 3 Today as we speak, 25 days before the election, over 54 million Americans are not registered 4 The highest concentration of those not 5 to vote. registered but eligible are minorities, 40 percent of б 7 Hispanic Americans, 30 percent of African Americans. We need to find ways to encourage the participation of 8 9 all individuals to get involved in the electoral 10 process and not set up new barriers to their 11 registration. The Brennan Center, which put out a report 12 13 this summer on voter suppression came up with five . 14 ways, five threats that is now hampering citizens' 15 ability, and they are the restrictions to voter 16 registration drives. We saw that take place this year 17 in Florida and Ohio where Secretaries of State and 18 statewide officials put barriers to nonpartisan 19 organizations to conduct voter registration drives. 20 We also know that there are barriers as 21 relates to --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Two minutes. 22 23 MS. BRAZILE: I've got you. Two minutes. 24 There are also barriers as it relates to 25 some citizens being purged inadvertently. There were

it

studies that came out of Florida. Up to 30 percent of 1 2 those who were purged were, you know, primarily Democratic 3 located in precincts orsubstantially more minorities. 4 We also know that proof of ID as proof of 5 citizenship when it's not required is another tactic 6 7 to suppress and intimidate voters, and also voting machine security. 8 9 And I have here with me today some 10 11 12

materials from not just some of the organizations, a broad array of organizations calling for emergency paper ballots since Congress failed to act on any meaningful election reform, and also a statement from . ACORN addressing some of the allegations around voter fraud.

Let me say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that I do requirements which are illegally administered, basically dilute voting participation individuals should not be required unless we can come up with some systematic way to encourage those citizens who may not have access to motor vehicle places and other government issued places to have access to those different requirements.

We should find a uniform way where there's having a clean voter registration list and encourage

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

other proof of eligibility, but we should not erect 1 2 more barriers that would hinder people's ability. 3 And lastly, according to <u>USA Today</u> several days ago, the Election Administration Commission, 4 which is responsible for implementing HAVA, has 5 6 produced a commission and produced a bipartisan report 7 on voter fraud. This report, which is caught in the 8 newspaper, is very -- did not find many instances of 9 voter fraud, has not been released publicly. hope that this Commission would encourage the Election 10 11 Administration Commission to release that report to 12 the public. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank Ms. you, Brazile. 14 15 Mr. Fund. 16 MR. FUND: Thank you. 17 I want to thank the Commissioners for 18 addressing this important issue because we may be only 19 three weeks away from repeating the 2000 Florida 20 election debacle, although this time not in one but in 21 several states with allegations of voter fraud, 22 intimidation, and manipulation of voting machines 23 added to the generalized chaos we saw in Florida. 24 It's time to acknowledge the U.S. still 25 has in many places a haphazard election system that is

more befitting an emerging nation than the world's leading democracy.

Walter Dean Burnham has called our system the world's sloppiest electoral process. How sloppy? Just ask the residents of Maryland last month who saw their primary election thrown into chaos after electronic voting machines couldn't be activated. Thousands of voters gave up and went home surrendering their right to vote.

Now we have the prospect of both candidates for governor in Maryland, the Republican Governor Bob Ehrlich and the Democratic challenger, Mr. O'Malley, calling on voters to cast their ballots by absentee. This shows a complete lack of confidence in our election system, and this presents us with two possible problems.

If Donna Brazile and others are legitimately worried about voter intimidation, the easiest ballots to intimidate voters over are absentee ballots because they're cast outside of the purview and the authority of election officials, and we have a long history in this country of people being intimidated either by their spouses, their relatives, their employers, union officials, or others into casting an absentee ballot a certain way. More

#### NEAL R. GROSS

2.2

absentee ballots equals more voter intimidation.

21.

In addition, absentee ballots are the most easy method to commit voter fraud, again, because they're cast outside the view and the authority of election officials.

The 2000 Florida recount was more than merely a national embarrassment. It left a lasting scar on the American political psyche. Indeed, the level of suspicion is such that many Americans are convinced that politicians can't be trusted to play by the rules and will either commit fraud or intimidate voters at the slightest opportunity.

Now, the 2000 election did result in some modest reforms at the federal level, such as the Help America Vote Act of 2002, but the implementation has been slow. Although I will say one positive outcome of the HAVA Act is that Donna Brazile's sister, if she did not produce all of the ID that she thought she needed to produce, would have been allowed under HAVA to request a provisional ballot. That provisional ballot would have been counted later after she had established her eligibility.

So under the current system if you don't have the ID, you're allowed a provisional ballot.

That provisional ballot will be counted if you are,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

indeed, an eligible voter.

America's election problems go beyond the strapped budgets of many local election offices. More insidious are flawed voter rolls, voter ignorance, lackadaisical law enforcement, and the shortage of trained volunteers at the polls.

Something like 70 percent of our poll workers are going to be retiring in the next year. It's an old person's occupation. We need to find some way to bring young people, college students, high school students into the process.

All of this adds up to an open invitation for errors, miscount or fraud. Reform is easy to talk about, but difficult to bring about. Many of the suggested improvements, such as requiring voters to show ID at the polls, are bitterly opposed. Others such as improving the security of absentee ballots, which Professor Pastor mentioned, are largely ignored.

And of course, the biggest growth sector of our election industry has been the turning of election day into election month through a new legal quagmire, election by litigation. Every close race now carries with it the prospect of demands for recounts, lawsuits, and seating challenges in Congress. Some people joke that they're waiting for

the day that the politicians can just cut out the middle man and settle all elections in court.

That gallows humor may be entirely appropriate given the predicament we face. The 2000 election may have marked a permanent change in how an election can be decided. We need to restore public confidence.

Ironically, Mexico and many other countries have election systems that are more secure than ours. It wouldn't be possible in Mexico to have a situation that we have in many of our American cities where the voter roles have more names on them than the U.S. Census lists as the total number of residents over the age of 18.

Philadelphia's voter roles, for instance, have jumped 24 percent in the last ten years at the same time the city's population has declined by 15 percent. Something is going on there, and it probably does not lead us to greater accuracy at the polls.

In the U.S. at a time of heightened security and rules that require us to show ID to travel and to enter most federal buildings, only about 25 states require some form of documentation in order to vote. A recent <u>Wall Street Journal-NBC</u> News poll confirms every other poll that I've seen on this

subject. It found that over 81 percent of those surveyed supported the requirement to show photo ID. This included two-thirds majorities of African Americans, two-thirds majorities of Democrats, two-thirds majorities of Hispanics.

In fact, I will make a stipulation I normally don't. If you can bring me evidence of a major public policy question which has the levels of support that we see on photo ID, 81 percent and greater, I'll make a donation to your favorite charity. You don't get beyond 81 percent. You simply don't.

Andrew Young, who is the former U.N.

Ambassador and the former Mayor of Atlanta, makes a very good point about photo ID. Of course we have to make sure this is accessible. Of course we have to make sure this is accessible. Of course we have to make sure that it's free to anyone who can't afford it. Of course we have to make sure that it's not another barrier.

But there's also an advantage to photo ID.

In modern 21st Century America if you don't have photo

ID, you are cut out of the mainstream of American

life. You can't really travel. You can't really

apply for a job. You can't really do a lot of things

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

in life that, frankly, would bring you into the mainstream and make your life more rich.

Andrew Young points out we are helping the poor. We are helping the indigent. We are helping many people out of the mainstream of American life if we get them a photo ID. They need to have it to be fully participatory in America's life.

registrations, illegal absentee ballots, shady recounts or old fashioned ballot box stuffing can be found in every part of the U.S. Fraud can be found in rural areas and in major cities. If you want to find some interesting witnesses for voter fraud, I suggest you go to St. Louis and Detroit where we've recently had Democratic primaries for mayor.

In these Democratic primaries, the losing candidates have presented some compelling evidence of either massive voter official incompetence or outright fraud. Freeman Hendrix, the losing candidate for Mayor of Detroit in the Democratic primary in the last election, says that the election was conducted under conditions of massive fraud. There's an ongoing FBI investigation into that, and he has called for photo ID at the polls, and he's a Democrat and a minority.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are

fraud

1 Investigations of voter inherently political because they often involve touchy 2 3 situations which people, frankly, don't want address fully, conditions that harken back to the 4 5 great debates we had over the civil rights struggle in the 1960s. 6 7 And I want to address that because we fought a great civil rights hurdle in the 1960s to 8 9 make sure that poll taxes and other barriers to voting 10 would be dropped and would never again stain America's 11 conscience. We need to continue that struggle. It's 12 one of the reasons we just extended the Voting Rights 13 Act for the next 25 years. 14 15 another civil right at stake here. 16

But I would remind people that there is When voters are disenfranchised by the counting of improperly cast ballots outright fraud or frankly, or, the incompetence of election officials, their civil rights are violated just as surely as if they had been prevented from voting. The integrity of the ballot box is just as important to the credibility of elections as access to the ballot box is.

Voting irregularities have a long pedigree in America, stretching back to the founding of the nation. Many people thought that those bad, old days

#### NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

17

18

< 19

20

21

22

23

24

had ended, just as many people think that there no 1 longer is any form of voter intimidation. 2 That's not the case. Voter intimidation 3 Voter fraud does continue. does continue. 4 give you an example of how historical ghosts can come 5 back to haunt us. 6 7 In 1948, pistol packing Texas sheriffs helped stuff ballot box 13, stealing a United States 8 9 Senate seat and sending Lyndon Johnson on his road to the White House. That's been documented in Robert 10 11 Caro's biography. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Less than two minutes, 13 sir. MR. FUND: Amazingly, 56 years later came 14 15 the 2004 primary election in that same part of Texas 16 with Representative Sero Rodriguez, a Democrat and 17 chairman of the Hispanic Caucus in the U.S. House, 18 charged that during the recount a missing ballot box 19 once again appeared in south Texas with just enough . 20 votes to make his opponent, the Democratic nominee, by 21 58 votes. 22 Political bosses, such as Richard J. Daley 23 or George Wallace, may have died, but they do have Even after Florida 2000, the media and 24 successors. 25 others tend to downplay or ignore stories of election

incompetence, manipulation or theft. Allowing such abuses to vanish into an informational black hole in effect legitimizes them.

The refusal to insist on simple procedural changes, such as requiring a photo ID, improving absentee ballot procedures, secure technology, and more vigorous oversight, accelerates our drift towards more chaotic and contested elections.

In conclusion, I would remind you that I never expected to live in a country where officials in places like Miami and other cities would hire the Center for Democracy, which normally oversees voting in places such as Guatemala or Albania, to send election monitors to south Florida and other places in the 2002 and 2004 elections. Scrutinizing our elections the way we have traditionally scrutinized voting in developing countries is unfortunately a necessary step in the right direction.

Before we get the clearer laws and better protections, we need to deal with fraud and voter mishaps. We need to have a sense of the magnitude of the problem we have. I hope and trust that you as Commissioners of this body can help in that process.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you very much.

And I must say that I am struck by the

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	amount of consensus that I heard from all of the
2	panelists. I think that everyone shares the concerns
3	regarding accessibility and also the integrity of the
4	maintaining the integrity of the ballot box.
5	At this point I'd like to open up the
6	floor for questions. Commissioner Kirsanow.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
8	Chairman.
9	First of all, I want to commend the staff
10	for putting together a splendid panel, and I want to
11	thank the panelists for great presentations.
12	And I've got several questions, but I'll
13	just ask one for now. And this, I think, would be to
14	Mr. Hearne.
15	Section 2 of the 14th Amendment is often
16	viewed as a predicate for the proposition that states
17	you have the prerogative setting standards for voting
18	qualifications. Do you see any problem, 14th
19	Amendment problem, with having a uniform photo ID
20	standard nationwide?
21	MR. HEARNE: Well, certainly both in the
22	Senate as well as in the House there has recently,
23	within the past several months been two bills, one
24	passing the House, the other being the McConnell
25	amendment offered in the Senate that would have

1 established a uniform federal ID.

Those were requirements that would have applied only to federal elections. So in that sense, it is something that would only be applicable under those provisions to federal elections. I think that's an appropriate action for the Senate, and I do not believe it's inconsistent with the Constitution scheme of devoting to states the responsibility or conducting elections.

However, what I would also say is I would also look at these kind of state election reforms as examples that certainly the federal government can embrace appropriately as well.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: As you probably know, at about the same time that that act was passed by the House but was referred to the Senate, I think it was the Georgia or Fulton County, Georgia court struck down a very similar Georgia photo ID. It wasn't simply photo ID, but that was the primary component of that piece of legislation; struck it down as violative of the 14th Amendment.

And I'm not sure if you're familiar with the features of them. I'm pretty sure you are.

I think some of the rationale had to do with the fact that those photo IDs could be obtained

### NEAL R. GROSS

or would be obtained from DMVs, and that not every state or -- I'm sorry -- not every county within the state had a DMV, and so it put a disproportionate burden on those residents of counties where there wasn't DMV.

Given that that piece of legislation, that state legislation in Georgia, at least is under challenge, do you have any opinion as to whether or not that legislation complies with 24th, 15th, 14th Amendment or the Voting Rights Act?

MR. HEARNE: Certainly. In terms of Georgia, I would note two things. Judge Murphy's decision that you're speaking of, you know, there's two pieces of Georgia legislation. I won't go through the back and forth. The initial piece of the Georgia photo ID legislation, the problem was, it was found by the court, it was not as accessible to a lot of people, as you mentioned, as it should be, and I certainly support making sure that any photo ID is accessible to everybody.

The reason Judge Murphy struck it down, and he said in his opinion, there's no problem with the state having photo ID. There was nothing wrong with photo ID as the basis in his opinion. What he said in his opinion was he said the problem here in

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Georgia was and the reason he enjoined it was you had 1 a photo ID requirement and then you have an election 2 two months later. And even if you make it free, not 3 everybody is going to be able to get it in two months. 4 So I would suggest instead a situation 5 6 similar to the Carter-Baker recommendations, which is 7 where you require photo ID in the federal legislation, where you have a lead time of two years or so. 8 9 know, so many be can discuss that, whether it's two years or a year or three years or whatever, but a 10 reasonable period of time for somebody to obtain the 11 12 That eliminates that objection. 13 again, the Georgia case did not . 14 conclude that photo ID is impermissible. It just said 15 that when you have it, you had better make sure that 16 people have the ability to access that ID for free. 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right, and the 18 Federal Election Integrity Act, I think, 19 become operative until I think the 2008 election. 20 it gives that two-year lead time you're talking about. 21 MR. HEARNE: That is correct, and so that 22 objection would be eliminated in that federal 23 legislation. 24 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. 25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Thank you for coming today, first of all.

Because the identification card seems to be what many people term intimidation, I think it was mentioned at 81 percent or so of America prefers or is in favor of an ID, national card or something like this. I don't know if the other percent includes many minorities, including Native Americans. There's actually an article that came out a couple of weeks ago. There was a report just two weeks ago of how an elderly Navajo woman, a woman who only speaks Navajo named Agnes Laughter was blocked from entering her chapter house to vote because she didn't have ID.

By Arizona and federal law, she should have been given a provisional ballot. She then would have three to five days to return to the polls with a form of identification. But when asked, Ms. Laughter said she didn't know if she could get back with an ID in three days' time, living in a remote area. So she was told to wait outside.

Clearly, the polling workers did not understand the law in this case, but this case also shows the bigger problem that many Native Americans face in new voter ID requirements. Unlike many other

citizens, Native Americans often do not carry official ID. They may not be able to use mail-in voting procedures because they need language assistance, the 203 of the Voting Rights Act, and the remoteness of many tribes make it particularly difficult to procure official identification.

My question is in a scenario like this, how can voter ID requirements be written or rewritten so that it will allow American Indians, like Agnes Laughter, to have their votes counted? That is a scenario that has actually happened.

Anyone.

MS. BRAZILE: Well, just recently in the State of Arizona, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected Arizona's Proposition 200 law that would require voter identification at the polls on November 7th. It's already having an impact in Arizona and other states where many of these state laws have been overturned not just in Georgia, but also in Missouri.

Just recently Judge Callahan struck down Missouri's new identification law saying it's an unconstitutional infringement on the right to vote.

The problem you have with all of these new so-called voter integrity proposals to stop voter fraud is that it impedes citizens' access to the

ballot. Many of these citizens don't have another day to come back to show ID, and they are often told when don't come with an ID that they must go home and get an ID rather than, oh, here's a provisional ballot.

So this is, again, a problem that, you know, we have to address and urge the citizens to stay, to go ahead and fill out a provisional ballot and to make sure that these poll workers who may have not gotten the information, that they're not -- some citizens are not required to show ID, if they showed ID at the time of registration.

So the problem for that citizen, like many other citizens is that unfortunately they would be disenfranchised. They would be told to go home and not come back, and they will not be given a provisional ballot.

MR. FUND: I would just add to that I was born in Arizona. I have many relatives there and am certainly familiar with the situation regarding Native Americans there. Some of those communities are extremely remote.

There are some special provisions. I would reiterate what I said. We certainly need better trained poll workers. Obviously that was a bureaucratic mistake. We need to correct that.

Secondly, one of the things that's certainly possible in those tribal areas is that you can have some way if they forget their ID card, some way that they can provide proof of it. The local tribal office can have a fax machine. You could fax a facsimile of the ID to the local authorities so that they actually would not have to travel to a government agency.

You can also perhaps have a tribal leader vouch for them and sign an affidavit confirming that they have their ID presented to them locally, and they would confirm that to other government officials.

There are certainly ways to do that, but .

I don't think you should take these unusual cases in very small rural areas and make that as the basis for a blanket condemnation of the photo ID law because I think there are ways you can address it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Professor Pastor.

DR. PASTOR: Yes. I think there are two distinct issues that are at the heart of our discussion right now on identification. First is whether voter identification at the polls is a legitimate and, indeed, a helpful way to improve the integrity of the vote, as well as access.

And the second one is what's the best

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

156 If you assume that the answer to the first process. question is yes, this is legitimate, what's the best process to achieve that outcome? I think on the first it's helpful to realize that of roughly 120 democracies in the world, more than 100 have good, fraud proof voter ID. Mexico undertook it with a very widespread, expensive

8 operation. They even have photo IDs on 9 registration list. So Haiti did it. Iraq has done 10 I think the United States has the capability of

doing it, but we haven't done it before.

And I think there is a legitimate reason to have people identify themselves as the person on . the voter list.

The second question is the harder one for America right now, is how do we get there. There are undoubtedly some people who think that pressing this issue forward quickly may, in effect, restrict the There's no doubt that if this is imposed franchise. and you only have the two month time frame to get a photo ID, that this is virtually impossible in many cases.

So we need to both have a longer lead time and, more importantly, the Carter-Baker Commission made very clear states have to play an affirmative

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

role in making sure that people who don't have driver's licenses can get a free photo ID.

This is going to take time, and it's going to be very expensive. When we explored different options in the Carter-Baker Commission of how to do this, we rejected a national identification card only because we thought that if that's going to happen, it should probably happen for security related reasons, and it would be very expensive. We estimated it would cost \$11 billion to do that.

It turns out that the real ID, which is the instrument that the Carter-Baker Commission recommended to be used may actually cost as much, according to the National Association of Secretaries of State, which would cause us all to rethink the process by which we do this.

It won't be easy to do. There are many people who don't have birth certificates, for example, in this country, and getting one may not be easy in all cases. But I think if this Commission on Civil Rights were to recommend that photo IDs are a legitimate form of identifying voters, but what's not legitimate is to go ahead with this without a good, extended process, without the adequate resources, without an affirmative role by the states, then we

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

shouldn't do it.

But if we view this as legitimate, we need to find the resources to do so.

Now, in our recommendation, we suggested using the real ID card, which is a driver's license that is upgraded by the 2005 law. And we estimated that roughly 88 percent of the eligible American citizens have driver's licenses, which is more than those who are registered. It's more like 72 to 73 percent.

So if, in fact, you used the driver's license, the upgraded driver's license, the photo ID, to register those additional people you've already expanded the registration base.

If on top of that, you have an affirmative role by the state to go out by mobile vans to old homes, to minority communities, to places in which we know are under registered, you offer still another opportunity to expand the number of people who would be registered and would be eligible to vote as well.

So, in effect, the ID with the right system can be used to expand access to voting and expand those who are registered, at the same time improving the registration list beyond where it is today.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just want to highlight MS. BRAZILE: 2 what Mr. Pastor was saying, and that is 30 percent of 3 Georgians over 75 do not have a driver's license. Brennan Center for Justice also concluded that fewer 4 5 than three percent of Wisconsin students -- that's another state that's trying to go to ID -- less than 6 7 three percent of students have driver's licenses listing their current addresses. The same study found 8 9 that African Americans have driver's licenses at half 10 the rate of whites, and the disparity increases among 11 younger voters or only 22 percent of black men age 18 12 to 24 had a valid driver's license. 13 So this could be, again, another form of . 14 discrimination and disenfranchisement unless we have 15 a process that is fair and open to everyone and not 16 just to go to Ken and have the resources to purchase 17 an ID. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow. 19 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I just want to 20 follow up on what Professor Castor said in terms of 21 the cost of this. 22 I think when the Congressional Budget 23 Office had estimated how much implementation of the 24 National Federal Election Integrity Act would cost, 25 which act would provide ID for free to those who swore

1 2 4 5 be mistaken. 6 the neighborhood of \$300 million. 8 curious as how you came up with that estimate. DR. PASTOR: No,

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that they were indigent and could not afford one, and the cost was estimated to be about \$20 per ID, they thought that the overall cost of that based on current likely voters and registrants would be about -- I may I read this quite some time ago -- in

But you said that you thought that the real ID component would cost \$11 billion, and I'm

I didn't. Ι was referring to a report that's just come out by the National Association of Secretaries of State and National Governors Association, as well. I think the problem is that when the real ID Act was passed, I think they clearly underestimated. I mean, it was to a certain extent an unfunded mandate. It shifted the burden to the states to come up with the process by which to determine who would get the photo ID and what the terms would be.

The Department of Homeland Security has the responsibility to set guidelines for determining lawful status. Up until this moment, they still have not done that. So we don't know for certain exactly what is required of the states, and we won't know until the Department of Homeland Security makes it

1 clear how to determine lawful status, what people need to do to show that, and how much it will cost for the 2 3 states to do it. So we have two very wide estimates, the 4 one that you mentioned, and the one that's just come 5 out in this report, but we really don't know what the 6 7 cost is because the Department of Homeland Security 8 has still not set the guidelines for determining who 9 gets a real ID card. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Do states have standards for hiring poll workers? 11 12 I mean specifically what I specifically 13 have in mind are situations where you have polling . workers who consistently give bad advice or make 14 15 mistakes or who intentionally deceive people, and so 16 are there standards for deciding who gets to become a 17 poll worker? And are there any type of sanctions for 18 the inability to correctly apply the rules? 19 And that's for anyone. 20 MR. FUND: Well, the most important thing, 21 course, is the level of training, and as 22 mentioned, we're seeing a growing shortage of poll 23 workers around the country because people lead busy 24 lives and increasingly it's left to the retired. And 25 many of them, with the growing complexity of elections

and the growing burdens of trying to comply with all 1 2 of these laws and regulations that have been heaped on 3 them, don't want to do the job anymore, and we frankly have to invest more in our poll workers. 4 5 Right now many states pay them \$20 in cab Some states do a better job of that. 6 fare or less. 7 I think that can be encouraged. We also encourage 8 young people, college students and high school 9 students to participate perhaps for credit, as well as 10 for some compensation. 11 The easiest way to make sure that a poll 12 worker does not misinterpret the rules or make a 13 foolish error which prevents someone from voting is to . 14 have more than one poll worker there who has been 15 adequately trained. Therefore, they can check each 16 other. 17 It's highly unusual in sophisticated 18 precincts where you have several poll workers that a 19 poll worker will turn someone away and not be countermanded by the supervisor or someone else who 20 21 usually has a much higher level of training. 22 I'm not saying that mistakes don't happen, 23 but I'm saying there are safeguards that can be built 24 into the system with enough resources and, frankly, 25

enough training that will minimize that to a very

large extent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BRAZILE: And I want to say that, you know, I've been an election day volunteer on numerous occasions when I wasn't working for a particular campaign or candidate, and many of these poll workers are, as John mentioned, honest, decent Americans that they're trying to đo the right thing, but unfortunately many states and counties do not have the resources to properly train them on new election procedures, on new election technology or, you know, essentially in some cases many of them are overwhelmed by just the number of people who are showing up now and voting.

So I don't want to put all of the burden on them. They are good, wonderful Americans who are often in many cases volunteering their time with a couple of dollars for cab fare and lunch, but we really need to upgrade and professionalize our voting operations and our voting apparatus across the country.

MR. HEARNE: Mr. Chairman, I would echo that observation. My experience with poll workers is that these are patriots. These are people who are there. What limited resources are paid to them, they're not there for that. They're there because

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

they believe in the system, and they're trying to contribute.

I would note that many states though have rules that make it very difficult. For example, an election worker, a poll worker can only be from a certain jurisdiction, which limits the number of potential people who can do it.

Some states have a requirement that says if you're going to be a poll worker, you have to work the whole day, which means you are sitting from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 in the evening. Some reforms in that process. Again, the Carter-Baker recommendation, as a number of them, would make it much easier for the election officials to find poll workers and for the poll workers to do their job.

One final point also in the Carter-Baker recommendation is when you do have a problem, and I would echo that the poll workers themselves, it's more often if there is a problem that the poll workers are responsible for, it's more often because of incompetence or poor training, to have the ability of the parties to participate in the candidates, to participate with observers who are there in order to monitor the process.

I know the Democrat party as well as the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Republican party generally have observers and the right under different states to put observers in polling places in order just to monitor the process. So if a problem does come up, you can get attention to it quickly. If a voting machine breaks down, you want to address it quickly before people are disenfranchised.

DR. PASTOR: Yes, I would agree with what

DR. PASTOR: Yes, I would agree with what has been said, but the average -- that poll workers are dedicated individuals -- but the average time for training is about two hours, and when you realize the rules differ so dramatically from state to state and county to county, it's impossible for a poll worker to really know all of the rules properly.

When we send election observers around, and I went around with them in '94, we just focus on two or three issues like provisional ballots. Every single polling site I went to had implemented those provisions differently.

And the other thing about poll workers is the average age is 72 years. So if you're talking about people having to be there from 7:00 to 7:00 p.m. and then work to reconcile the vote count at the end of that, these people are very tired at the end of that day. It's very hard.

## NEAL R. GROSS

, 25

1 At American University we're recruiting 2 100 poll workers to go out to our polling sites in Washington to work with D.C. elections in order to get 3 both younger people in there and people who are a 4 5 little bit more technologically advanced than the 6 average 72 year old. 7 In Mexico, they look at poll workers like 8 they look at jury duty. It's a civic obligation. 9 percent of the people in a precinct are called to be 10 trained. From that they take a small percentage of 11 the very best people. Average citizens, totally 12 trained when they go out there on election day. 13 would be a good model for us as well. 14 We need to focus on poll workers. You're 15 absolutely right to focus on that right now. 16 not doing enough to train them. We're not doing 17 enough to get citizens actively engaged in that, and 18 frankly, the decentralization of our system makes it 19 very hard for poll workers to really know what the 20 proper rules are. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor. 22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. And 23 thank all of you all for coming. 24 wanted to actually echo a 25 comments that have been made about the poll workers,

and I come at this having served as counsel to Bob McDonnell when there were over a million votes cast, and as you all probably know, the margin of difference was 360 votes, and it was an historic event, and being a lawyer, I was, frankly, glad to be involved and in the middle of it.

But I'm glad to say that I saw no fraud in Virginia. I saw a lot of sloppiness, and at the poll worker level what I saw was a lot of folks who were well intentioned, well meaning, hard working senior citizens who were tired, confused, and you are only able to get to the nub of the matter when you had the partisans on both sides looking over their shoulders, but that only happened during the recount process really.

So I want to echo all of those comments because it was really my sense, and it really manifested itself, I thought, in the fluctuations we least, from the saw, at more sophisticated jurisdictions like an Henrico County outside of Richmond, which is somewhat affluent. Very little fluctuations in voting patterns versus the City of Richmond or Newport News, where you would flip two or 3,000 votes, and you would dig into it, and it was just error because of the training and different

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 things in those communities. So at least in Virginia, at least, 2 3 really saw the problem one of training. One thing that bothered me, 4 however, 5 related to electronic voting because the question --6 and this was a question the three-judge panel had to 7 grapple with -- in Virginia law at least there was not 8 a requirement that you had to show error relative to 9 this electronic voting machine. In fact, the law was silent on the issue, and that put the issue before the 10 11 three judge panel. I wanted to get all of you all's thoughts 12 13 on electronic voting machines and whether or not you . would, for example, require some type of paper trail 14 15 be mandated or, if not, whether or not for purposes of a recount or questioning the vote tally, you would 16 17 require some type of finding of error relative to that electronic machine. 18 19 It really is a question, and I don't know 20 where most states are, but it's a question that has 21 not been answered in Virginia. 22 Well, since the year 2000, DR. PASTOR: 23 the number of machines that are electronic have gone

from roughly ten percent to 40 percent.

include optical scans as electronic machines, it has

24

25

If you

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gone to 80 percent.

So we focused on that to a great degree, again, to realize the vulnerabilities of electronic machines.

Tn the Carter-Baker Commission we recommended that there should be a voter verifiable paper audit trail because as we know, electronic machines like computers do freeze up, and if you don't have a paper audit trail, you don't know if you've lost votes. You don't know if votes have been manipulated.

We also recommended that there be an audit of a certain percentage of those machines, say, two . percent, so as to assess whether or not the machines and the paper coincide with each other and to be able to test that over time so that there wouldn't be a bias in that system.

I think these are very important steps that need to be taken with regard to electronic machines because there's a huge accident waiting to happen.

In North Carolina, there was a vote on the Agricultural Commissioner in 2004 in which the number of votes separating the two leading candidates was less than the number of votes that were lost as a

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

result of electronic machines that broke down, and if we think of that perhaps happening on a statewide or a national basis, this would be a terrible tragedy.

So we need to move quickly to think about implementing a verifiable paper audit trail and also to make sure that the source codes, that there's adequate oversight by state election commissions and by the election assistants commission to make sure that the source codes of those electronic machines cannot be manipulated and won't be manipulated.

MR. FUND: I would just add to that every time that you have had technological advance in vote counting, you have brought with it suspicion and concerns, many of them legitimate, some of them conspiratorial. Electronic voting machines are no different.

We certainly have to spend more time and attention. I've examined the background of some of the procedures of the voting machine companies. Some of these companies I, frankly, wouldn't hire. I think it's a relatively new industry. There are going to be some new entrants. I think quality control has to improve.

One of the things we have to always ask ourselves is why is it there are these concerns about

electronic voting machines? 1 In part it's because unlike ATMs, voting machines are produced on a much 2 3 cheaper basis with much less sophistication. 4 In fact, the average electronic voting 5 machine only costs about 15 percent as your local ATM machine bill because the ATM machine deals with money. 6 I would submit to you. --8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Of course, that's not 9 what they sell it to the local government at. 10 MR. FUND: Of course not. 11 (Laughter.) 12 That's why we need competing MR. FUND: 13 bids. 14 submit the votes are at least 15 valuable as money, probably far more so. We need to 16 spend the resources to make sure the electronic voting 17 machines do what they say they do. 18 Now, having said that, clearly I think 19 some οf the fears about Manchurian computer 20 programmers in the back room manipulating the system 21 and coming up with completely different results are 22 somewhat overblown. I would remind you we have used 23 optical scan computing equipment to count the votes 24 from optical scan ballots from 25 to 30 years now. 25 There has not been one documented case of those

So let's put this into

counting systems, of those computer systems, which 1 bear a lot of resemblance to the electronic voting 2 3 machine computers, ever having been manipulated to 4 change an election result. There has not been one 5 documented case of that. 6 perspective.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'd also cite you Joe Andrew who is the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. fact, he was hand picked by Bill Clinton. He is the only chairman I know of a national political party who from a technology background, and he cautioned us that while there certainly are legitimate concerns over electronic voting machines, not to go

Hе mentions, for example, that the Leadership Conference of Civil Rights has generally supported electronic voting because study after study has found that the voters who are most likely to be helped by these machines are (a) the disabled because (b) they can vote without assistance; the less educated, the machines resemble ATMs and are very easily used; (c) lower socioeconomic groups who often trust machines more than people; (d) the truly elderly because you can increase the type size; and of course, people who do not have English as a first language

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

too far.

	173
1	because the machine could easily be programmed to
2	accommodate any number of languages, and citizens are
3	often more comfortable voting on those machines.
4	So we have to get the machines right, but
5	the machines are a significant technological advance.
6	If we get it right, they're going to make voting a lot
7	easier and a lot more accurate.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I have a question for
9	Professor Pastor.
10	Wading through the Carter-Baker report,
11	one of the more significant recommendations is this
12	notion of moving responsibility from localities to the
13	state and then further up to the federal government,
14	this concept of interoperability.
15	It seems to me that in theory, I think,
16	that, well, it's an interesting idea, but if there is
17	resistance from the localities, from this shift in
18	power, in responsibility, I don't see how it will
19	work.
20	Could you just discuss how we would
21	overcome the barriers to the localities wanting to
22	maintain the traditional control and responsibility
23	that they've had?
24	DR. PASTOR: It's an excellent question,
25	sir, and I think it really goes to the heart of our

in very

1 electoral problems because in the United States our 2 electoral system is so decentralized that it has 3 become dysfunctional. We don't have one election for 4 President. We don't even have 50 elections for 5 President, which is what the founding fathers 6 anticipated in the Constitution. We actually have 7 13,000, and we discovered that, of course, in the State of Florida in 2000 when the counties were the 8 ones that were really in charge, and they were often 9 10 implementing basic rules and standards 11 different ways from each other, and were responsible 12 for everything from the design of ballot to the 13 training of poll workers and everything else. 14 In the Help America Vote Act, by giving 15 money to the states through the Election Assistance 16 Commission, I think the intention was to help 17 encourage the states to impose uniform standards and, 18 most importantly, a single registration list which 19 would be interactive and which would be top-down. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Have all of the states 21 accepted money? 22 PASTOR: All of the states have 23 accepted the money, but they haven't all implemented 24 it in the way that I believe it was intended with 25 regard to registration lists.

One of the biggest problems we have with the registration list that Thor and others have pointed to is that up until very recently most of the registration lists were all decided at the county level. The states had devolved responsibility to the counties and municipalities and hadn't integrated the registration list, and as a result you had grossly inflated registration lists or inaccurate registration lists.

The idea of HAVA was that there should be a statewide interactive top-down registration list. It's not clear that all of the states have done that. The states had devolved authority and responsibility for elections for one good functional reason, which is that each county has to concentrate on the bottom of its electoral ballot, and therefore, you need to program at that level.

And, secondly, they didn't want to put any money behind this either, just as the federal government didn't put one cent behind any of these elections until the Health America Vote Act.

But if we are going to really modernize our electoral system, it's our belief that the states are going to have to assert a lot more responsibility for this process and also to transform the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

more

it's

it's

that

administration of elections so that than bipartisan; nonpartisan rather impartial; that it's autonomous, it's independent, and it's professional. All of these qualities don't really exist in many of the states right now. So I think increasingly we feel the importance of focusing on administration and encouraging the states to play the role that the founding fathers initially intended for them to play, which is to be primarily responsible for statewide systems rather than to decentralized the process to the locality level. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: much, Mr. Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, thank you very Thank you very much, panelists.

I guess I'll just be out front. I start off looking at this as even in this discussion today there's been kind of a kitchen sink approach to the whole idea of there's something wrong with the way we vote, and people throw out voter regs. People throw out polling fraud, absentee, whatever it is. I'd like to try and parse that out a little bit, much as the U.S. Election Assistance Commission tried to parse it out.

And, Mr. Chair, I don't know what our

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 jurisdiction is over that or not, but if that report 2 is being bottled up, I wonder if we can use our 3 subpoena power to get it out. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree. 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But I just want to 6 let's go through it piece by piece. There's been a 7 lot of talk about deadwood on the voter reg. rolls, 8 more people than there are actual numbers in the 9 population. What hard evidence do we have that any of 10 that has resulted in people widespread, rampant, 11 people voting who shouldn't be voting because of where 12 they are on the registration list? 13

And let me just step back and say I know . this stuff from my own experience pretty well in California, having run and won, and done many things in many elections, watched how county registrars have to validate the incredible initiative process in I've seen Bruce Springstein registered California. five times. I've seen Mick Jagger registered. seen all of these people who put their names on. They generally get caught.

But I'm just wondering what do we know? Where's the hard evidence saying that there's a correlation between these vast disproportionate numbers of registration in an area and actual voter,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

people using those names and going to the polls and 1 2 voting? Well, I'm a Californian, and 3 MR. FUND: I'll just give you two examples very recently from 4 The City of Compton, where the mayor's 5 California. race has been embroiled in all kinds of federal 6 7 investigations. There have been documented examples 8 of massive fraud using absentee ballots, and the City 9 Industry where there's ongoing federal of an 10 investigation along with a state investigation that the city has basically suppressed voter registration 11 12 from some candidates. It's a small area, largely 13 commercial. The city council is in league with . 14 various interest groups there, primarily the large 15 commercial industry, to prevent people from voting and 16 prevent them from ousting the incumbent 17 establishment. 18 Those are just two cities in one state. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay, fine. But I 20 think you just proved my point because you start 21 talking about -- the first thing you started to talk 22 to was absentee fraud, which is a wholly different 23 creature than registration fraud. You don't have to have --24

MR. FUND: It was also registration fraud

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in Compton, and I can give you the specifics on it.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, then I'd like to see, one, how it's done and, two, what kind of prosecutions have been brought. I mean, do you know how many prosecutions have been brought over time?

MR. FUND: No. Let me be very clear about this. One of the things that we have found, at least I have found in my interviews with prosecutors are they put a lot of these cases on the bottom of their pile, and for a very simple reason. It's a political hot potato. You are guaranteed to anger half of the political establishment if you bring a voting fraud If you prosecute a Republican, you're going to . anger the Republicans. If you prosecute a Democrat, you're going to anger the Democrats. And, of course, there's the racial component. If you investigate areas in which some people might be involved, you're going to be often accused of having ulterior motives in that respect.

I have quotes in my book from several prosecutors who say they are very leery of prosecuting these cases. One of the things that you find even the prosecutions we do have, almost all of them are plea bargained so that the person will serve only community services or perhaps a fine. There are almost no cases

in which someone actually goes to jail. 1 2 I have talked to poll workers and people 3 involved in the business who say the prosecution of 4 voting fraud is at such a low level and so seldom 5 leads to jail time that, frankly, for many people it's 6 just the cost of doing business. 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But let me just ask 8 In the context of absentee voter you this then. 9 fraud, how does an ID card do anything to prevent 10 that? 11 Well, you need to have both, MR. FUND: 12 and I said that in my testimony. Photo ID at the 13 polls is important. I also think we frankly, as a 14 public policy question need to ask ourselves do we 15 really want the situation in which every year there's 16 a growing number of people who cast absentee ballots. 17 In 1980 only five percent of Americans 18 voted absentee or early. Now it's between 25 and 30 19 percent. Oregon has abolished the polling place. You 20 wake up on election day in Oregon. If you haven't 21 voted by mail, you're going to find it very difficult 22 to vote. 23 Washington State is moving inthat direction. California, over 40 percent of the ballots 24 25 are cast absentee. I think we have to question

1 whether or not we want to continue that process and literally have people voting over an entire month. 2 3 You know, when does election day become 4 election month, and is that, frankly, constitutional? 5 That issue, I think, will eventually have to be addressed with the courts. 6 7 We need ballot security for absentee ballots as well. Professor Pastor has mentioned that 8 9 you can take the signatures on an absentee ballot and 10 compare them for their digital equivalent. You can also using very simple technology require someone to 11 put their thumbprint on a ballot and have that as a 12 permanent record to see if the absentee ballot matches . 13 14 the real person. 15 You need both. You need --16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let me go to the 17 second question then. I mean, one of the things that 18 the Election Assistance Commission report seemed to 19 indicate is that there is a greater potential for 20 absentee ballot fraud amongst all the different things 21 that people talk about. 22 Where is the evidence of polling place 23 fraud, of people on election day assuming different 24 identities and going? 25 And I guess part of it is, you know, all

1 of this gets to the little outrage part of America, 2 which is why is someone doing that, but I guess part of it has to do with context as well. I mean, with 3 all due respect to Mr. Pastor, I get a little offended 4 5 when someone says, "Well, Mexico does it better than 6 us." Well, if you had Mexico's voting system 20 7 ago, you darn well would have changed it 8 9 radically because of the way that elections were administered, but taking that aside, you take these 10 11 instances, and they become anecdotal. They become, 12 well, I know this person or Mickey Mouse came or what 13 have you. 14 The fact is over how many periods of time 15 and over how many electoral votes have been cast in 16 the past ten years and what percentage of those can 17 anyone estimate. What percentage of those had to do 18 with out and out, quote, unquote, fraud, and then what 19 type of fraud? 20 again, that goes under Because, 21 question of why are we choosing all of these different 22 remedies that may not be appropriate for what it is 23 we're trying to guard against. 24 MR. HEARNE: Let me answer your question. 25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'd just like to add

1	Commissioner Yaki raised a very interesting point, and
2	I would like to add that I think that he's basically
3	saying that this is an empirical question, and I think
4	that that question could be posed to both sides of the
5	equation, both voter intimidation and voter fraud.
6	Do we have a baseline? Do we have
7	sufficient evidence to quantify the nature of the
8	problem?
9	That's one question,b ut I guess the
10	follow-up thought is that in this era of very close
11	elections, it doesn't matter because even if it is a
12	very small percentage, it could make a significant
13	difference on whether the President is President Gore
14	or President Bush.
15	MS. BRAZILE: But so could a machine that
16	is not functioning properly.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree.
18	MS. BRAZILE: So could a machine that
19	could be tampered by using a palm device. That's why
20 <sup>.</sup>	all of these issues should be looked at in terms of
21	electoral reform comprehensive to clean up our
22	electoral process.
23	But I would urge the Commission to have
24	that report released as soon as possible from the
25	Election Administration Commission. We should

denounce voter fraud wherever we see it. If we know 1 about a fraud, if we see it happening, if we see some 2 citizens attempting to vote twice, there is a penalty 3 for anybody attempting to hack the system or to 4 register twice or vote twice, a penalty, \$5,000. 5 6 That's why voter fraud is rare. That's why you rarely 7 read of instances of voter fraud. 8 And let me just say in 2000 in Missouri, 9 Secretary of State claimed that 79 voters were the registered with addresses at vacant lots, but there 10 11 was an investigation later, and they found out that 12 they were people who actually lived in those houses. 13 The problem we have in America today is that our voter registration lists are incomplete. 14 15 They're inaccurate, and they haven't been cleaned in 16 such a long time who knows who's on those. I'm sure 17 Bruce Springstein, Mary Poppins, Santa Claus and everybody else. Until we get serious about how we 18 19 conduct elections in this country, we will continue to 20 have problems. 21 MR. HEARNE: Mr. Chairman, let me answer 22 the one question. 23 Commissioner Yaki, you asked the question 24 about how many people have voted in person illegally

that ID would have prevented. Detroit Free Press did

a study in Michigan last December. They found more 1 than 120 people cast ballots in the name of 2 3 people. Now, you might say 120 fraudulent votes 4 that could have been prevented by ID aren't enough, 5 but tell that to the citizens of Washington State 6 7 where they decided their governor's race by about that margin. 8 You find very close as we saw in Florida, 9 10 thin margins, as Chairman Reynolds is noting. 11 margins in elections are deciding not only who's our 12 President, who's our governor, who's our Senator being 13 decided. So 120 votes, as were found by the -- and . 14 that was in a limited sample in Michigan. Now, by definition, a ballot cast at a 15 16 polling place in the name of a dead person is a ballot 17 cast fraudulently by somebody who, if they had to 18 present a photo ID, would likely have been prevented from doing it. So it is a kind of reasonable common 19 2.0 sense reform to stop documented cases of vote fraud. 21 Donna, you mentioned the case in Missouri. 22 With the study that we did after the 2000 election, 23 that election by the Democrat Secretary of State, at that point Becky Cooke, found that 48 people just 24

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

appeared at different polling places and cast a ballot

illegally without ever being authorized to do so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it is a documented fact when we look for it that it happens. Now, many states don't have an ID requirement at all. So it can go on very easily. The only thing in St. Louis, Missouri that would prevent Ritzy the Dog from casting a ballot that would void mine or some other voter in Missouri is the fact that somebody coming to the polling place pretending to be Ritzy Mekler, who we found was a cocker spaniel, had to first provide an identification.

That's why it's a confidence building.

That's why we actually find that these kind of ID requirements, again, when we make sure everybody gets one and we have it for free; when we have that, you find it actually increases participation in the elections as the Professor Lott study found.

MR. FUND: Donna is, I think, very right.

Not all of the allegations ultimately pan out, and I think we have to be discriminating.

However, remember we're dealing both in the case of voter intimidation and in the case of voter fraud with illegal behavior. So just to point to the number of prosecutions, just to point to the number of people who caught at it, since it's illegal

1	behavior, you're not going to catch the entire
2	problem.
3	To say that it's rare is the same thing as
4	to say that we don't know the full extent of the drug
5	problem in this country because it's illegal. You're
6	not going to know all of it because people are not
7	going to volunteer information about it. It's in the
8	shadows.
9	I've actually seen academics
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I really have
11	MR. FUND: I've actually seen academic
12	studies
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: To compare voting to
14	the drug problem is just a stretch.
15	MR. FUND: Commissioner Yaki, it's illegal
16	behavior and it's in the shadows. One of the things
17	I have seen academic studies that have actually
18	purported to show that the level of
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So is taking a bribe.
20	Go ahead.
21	MR. FUND: To repeat, I have seen academic
22	studies that have actually purported to show that the
23	level of voter fraud in this country is very small,
24	simply by going out and interviewing people in the
25	election process.

I'm sorry. You're going to have people who commit these activities, whether they're intimidation or whether they're fraud, who are not going to admit it, and in addition, the election officials are not exactly going to demonstrate or talk about the frailties in their system because that reflects poorly on their own behavior and their own performance.

Question about the photo ID bill that's floating in the Senate now after it passed the House, and I'd like to get your honest opinions about it because I seem to have heard that all of you, and maybe I'm wrong, believe that, one, it's a good idea; two, there's some issues regarding accessibility -- I'm not saying all. You know who I'm talking to, Ms. Brazile -- there are issues of accessibility that you think might be something that would be worth addressing.

So one of the question is whether or not you think that having this kind of new photo ID, whether it's getting a birth certificate, whether it's producing this kind of stuff, given the statistics and given the fact that when you look at the demographics of who would probably be impacted the most, it's lower income. It's minorities. It's people whose English

is not their first language. 1 How do we get accessibility to those 2 folks? How do we do it in terms of money? How do we 3 do it in terms of outreach? 4 And given the fact that HAVA has been 5 under funded by \$800 million anyway, what realistic 6 shot is there that that's ever going to happen and 7 should we care, which I think we should. 8 9 DR. PASTOR: I think we should as well. Let me answer both your first question and the second 10 11 question. 12 The first question is how much fraud is 13 there out there. My answer to that question is we . 14 don't know. We don't know. I mean we could know if 15 we really cared by doing something very simple that 16 most countries do, which is they have a poll book at 17 election site, each and they 18 irregularity that occurs during the course of the day. 19 For example, one time I went to vote, and 20 I found that somebody had already voted under my name. 21 Now, I had no recourse at that point to find out why 22 this had occurred, whether there was some error or 23 whatever else, and the polling station itself didn't

> **NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

keep any record of it. So we wouldn't know whether

it's a large number, whether it's no number or

24

25

register

every

1 | whatever.

My personal view is that we're likely to see a small number if it occurs. We don't know how much, but even a small number is important because if there's a close election, it makes a big difference, and it's also --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I'm not disagreeing with that.

DR. PASTOR: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: The second question is a critical one that you just asked, which is if these voter ID requirements are legislated without adequate funding, without adequate time to make sure that they are implemented in a way that's fair, accessible, and indeed, can enlarge the area of registration, is this a good idea?

And my answer is no, and I think that's where the Carter-Baker Commission -- the Carter-Baker Commission was very clear in saying that we should do a voter ID, but we have to do it in the right way, and the right way means to expand the registration list to make sure that a photo ID is accessible to people who normally wouldn't have it or have a driver's license or whatever else.

So I think if this panel could all agree

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 that those two elements are absolutely central to 2 going forward with this and that you can't go forward 3 with one without the other, than I think that would be a step forward. 4 I think if this Commission were to issue 5 a similar statement along those lines, I think it 6 7 would be very positive, too. MR. FUND: I would agree briefly with Bob 8 9 Pastor that the two do go together, that you do, in 10 fact, need to make the ID accessible, and I think that 11 I mean, as the judge in Georgia that's a concern. 12 said, there's no problem with ID. The issue is to 13 make sure that it is available to everyone. 14 Let me cite the Missouri case. 15 Missouri, the Missouri legislature provided for nine 16 mobile vans to go around particularly to nursing 17 They also provided that there were more than 18 200 locations throughout the state, one in every 19 county, and those mobile vans would go into particular 20 neighborhoods, and there was a two-year transition 21 period. 22 Some may say they should have done even 23 more to provide the free ID. My point is that when 24 the legislature makes that kind of accommodation to 25 make sure everybody does have free ID, that should

take the partisanship out of the equation when we make 1 sure that people do have it. 2 And as Andrew Young said, that's why he 3 embraced the concept, because what we're doing is 4 we're going to those very same people, and we're 5 saying not only do you now have a free ID that allows 6 you to vote. It will increase your participation and 7 confidence in voting. 8 9 But it will also allow you to participate in all the other things that we do in modern life that 10 11 require an ID. That's a good thing. That's a good 12 thing to enable and empower those people. 13 PARTICIPANT: A quick question. when you say "free ID," let me just ask you: do you mean that 14 the actual ID itself is free? 15 If you need any 16 predicate documents to get that ID? How does that work out? 17 MR. FUND: Yeah, there's two things. One, 18 19 in our report we decided to build on the real ID law. 20 The real ID is the driver's license. Okay? 21 lot of states require you to pay for a driver's 22 license and presumably you would do that, but if you don't have a driver's license, then we recommend the 23 24 equivalent of the real ID, which would be given to

people free, which would serve the same purpose, not

for driving but for identification purposes.

Secondly, it's very important that this affirmative role by the state has to be incorporated in it. Historically the United States is one of the few democracies that doesn't go out to register voters. It's passive. It lets voters come in.

We take this a very large step, and Republicans, including Secretary Baker, accepted this importance of this step, for the state to play an affirmative role to go out with mobile offices to certain areas which traditionally are likely to not have identification cards of any kind. So that requires additional money to do that and additional personnel and resources as well to do that properly.

MS. BRAZILE: The Constitution prohibits any form of payment in terms of voting, and as long as there are millions and millions of Americans who do not have access to getting the form of ID that would make them, therefore, eligible to vote and participate, we should not impose this burden on states and local government, which by the way have failed already in implementing HAVA.

By not fully funding HAVA and the mandates that they've imposed on the states, what we have now in some states, we have just inconsistency in how the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 rules are applied in different areas, different counties, different neighborhoods. 2 3 So I'm opposed to the real ID provision until we have such a system in place so that every 4 American has access to it and not just some Americans. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez. 6 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. The Election 7 8 Assistance Commission has that people support stronger 9 criminal laws and increased enforcement of existing 10 laws with respect to both fraud and intimidation. Sometimes it seems like they're focusing on fraud 11 investigations, but little is done on intimidation, 12 13 that people direct you to the wrong polling place and 14 nothing really -- they're not held responsible for 15 those things. 16 The question is what additional criminal 17 laws are needed and how can this be made a high 18 priority for the Department of Justice. 19 MR. FUND: Well, I would just submit that 20 I think resources are spent on tracking down voter over to the Justice 21 intimidation. Ιf you go 22 Department, the Civil Rights Division, you will find 23 dozens and dozens of lawyers there, close to 200, and 24 their responsibility is to make sure that the Voting 25 Rights Act is enforced, and to make sure that

prosecutors go out and investigate claims.

A task force was sent down to Florida after 2000 by Attorney General Janet Reno. There are a lot of people there, but if you want to find an attorney there whose sole job is to investigate allegations of voter fraud at the federal level, you'll find one human being, one person.

So I would submit to you we need resources spent on both, but I think if anything there's an imbalance now.

MS. BRAZILE: There's no imbalance.

There's no imbalance. On election day both in 2000 and 2004, there was direct contact to the Justice. Department on instances of voter intimidation and voter suppression. I can recall there were calls, and this is under the Clinton administration, there were calls directly to the Justice Department reporting unauthorized personnel blocking access to polling places in some areas in Leon County in Florida.

Senator Barack Obama has introduced S. 1975, which is called the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2005, which would make it a crime punishable up to one year in prison and a fine up to \$100,000 for knowingly deceiving a person regarding the time, place, or manner of

election in any federal election, or qualifications for restrictions on voter eligibility for any federal election with the intention to prevent such person from exercising their right to vote.

I was home in Louisiana in 2002 to help my Senator, Mary Landrieu in her reelection. That was my last election, and I was driving down Canal Street and an individual walked out. He was paid. I don't know who he was paid by, and said, "Election day is Tuesday."

Election day was that Saturday. It was a runoff election. So people are paid, and I said, "Yo, man, you can go to jail for passing out that information," and when I told him he could go to jail, he said, "I didn't know."

So the truth is that unfortunately these schemes happen. I can tell you as somebody who has managed and run campaigns all my life, all my life, I have seen some of the craziest things happen on election day, but I have told my staff if anybody, any volunteer, any paid worker or unpaid worker is ever caught suggesting that any American should vote on another day other than that election day, they would be fired instantly and be turned into the proper authorities.

So this happens unfortunately in 1 country. I've seen it up close and personal, and we 2 3 should outlaw it, and we should make it a national crime for people to knowingly stop and prohibit people 4 5 from voting. 6 MR. FUND: I can support that sa well, but 7 let me just make one point about the 2000 Florida 8 election. Yes, there were reports of police cars in 9 one instance setting up a road block to try to catch 10 someone, and that was close to a polling place. There 11 were reports of other people being blocked from 12 voting. There were reports made to the Justice 13 Department. I agree. 14 But there were ten weeks in which Attorney 15 General Janet Reno and the Clinton administration 16 investigated those allegations. Please bring me the 17 report. Please bring me the report which found any 18 substantial substance to those allegations. Bring me 19 the Justice Department report. 20 It does not not exist. 21 MS. BRAZILE: This Commission own 22 investigated and went into Florida back in 2000, 23 following that election and heard directly from some 24 of those individuals. 25 MR. FUND: The Justice Department has far

1 more resources --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, okay. 2 3 MS. BRAZILE: I just want to note that this Commission did its job. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. Hearne and 5 6 then Commissioner Kirsanow. 7 MR. HEARNE: I will briefly say Donna and 8 I share a concern over this point. The concern about 9 voter fraud and intimidation is a very real concern. 10 It does unfortunately happen. It's an ugly practice, 11 and it needs to stop. 12 Missouri passed, picking up on the Carter-13 Baker recommendation, Missouri adopted a statute to . 14 increase the felony for any effort just as you 15 proposed, Donna, in our Missouri Voter Protection Act 16 exactly as was recommended in Carter Baker that would 17 say it is an additional very serious felony, the top category of felony for somebody to intentionally 18 19 misdirect somebody in the polling place or otherwise 20 to try to interfere with somebody exercising their 21 right to vote. 22 It is wrong in this country, in the United 23 States of America that any person anywhere, any state, any city wakes up on election day and tries to 24

exercise their constitutional right to vote and faces

1	some impediment in doing that or somebody who has a
2	scheme to try to prevent them. That is to be deplored
3	and seriously prosecuted, and I absolutely think
4	there's unanimity about our concern over that.
5	Again, you know, there's some good
6	proposals to do that. The organization I represent,
7	the American Center for Voting Rights, did a study of
8	the '04 election and found some instances of voter
9	intimidation. Those were reported.
10	It doesn't matter by who those activities
11	are engaged in. It shouldn't happen at all by anybody
12	ever.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.
15	The Civil Rights Commission did go down to
16	Florida after the 2000 election after there were
17	scores of reports about voter intimidation and fraud,
18	and the Commission heard considerable testimony and
19	was able to gleán two instances in which there may
20 .	have been some blockage of voting.
21	One was the empty State Trooper car that
2 <b>2</b>	was across the street from a polling place. That was
23	the extent of it.
24	The other one was the traffic check point
25	two miles away and not even on the same road as

1 2 3 4 5 lights and the usual check points. 6 7 8 9 wasn't able to find anything else. 10 11 12 13 absentee ballots. 14 15 16 proliferation of that.

another polling place, which check point actually -- the allegation was that there were a certain number of people who were stopped, and the people who were stopped were people with broken tail

So the Commission did go down there and despite all of the allegations, that's the extent of what we were able to find and the Justice Department

That's not to say there wasn't anything, but we have to look at the empirical evidence, but my concern goes more to Mr. Fund raised the issue of We have been concerned about a . photo ID and what kind of safeguard does photo ID present if we have absentee ballots and there's

The Miami election of 1998, the mayoral election was set aside because of irregularities with respect to absentee ballots, and just as an aside, in Florida, again, race decided for President by 579 votes, and the Miami Herald was able to discern 2,000 people voting illegally. That changes the election or could have the potential for changing the election.

With respect to the absentee ballots, does Mexico have biometrics that they attach to their

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ballots	or	the	registration	lists
---------	----	-----	--------------	-------

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if has there so, been any consideration given or assessment done either by the Carter-Baker Commission or elsewhere as to what the cost of any kind of biometric protection either at the polling place or by absentee ballot. It seems to me that they would also encourage -- Ms. Brazile, you were talking about multiple forms of identification having to be produced. Sometimes poll workers aren't aware of the fact that provisional ballots may obviate that need, but if you've got one uniform standard that immutable, that no one can effectively even challenge you, that that might be a means by which you. can insure both integrity and also access.

But I'm concerned about has there been a cost assessment associated with that.

DR. PASTOR: First off, with regard to Mexico, and Mr. Yaki is absolutely right, Mexico -- I started observing Mexican elections in 1986 and learned everything I needed to know about electoral fraud.

#### (Laughter.)

DR. PASTOR: The Mexicans had perfected dozens -- in fact, they had more words for electoral fraud than Eskimos have for snow.

## NEAL R. GROSS

:	1
:	2
	3
4	1
Ī	5
6	5
-	7
8	3
9	9
1(	)
11	L
12	2
13	3
14	1
15	5
16	5
17	7
18	3
19	)
2.0	)
21	-
22	2
23	}

25

Because of that, however, they leaped over a 20-year period to a system that is significantly more advanced than ours, frankly, right now. They do have biometric identification cards, which were introduced and which 99 percent of the voting population have them.

They have, as I said, not only biometric voter cards, which they actually use for everything now because they're so fraud proof, but they also have photos in the registration list of each of the people, too.

They have not historically had a problem with absentee ballots until this last election where, for the first time, they allowed people in the United States and abroad to vote, but only a very small percentage did, but they still needed their voter card, and also they had some special sites for voting as well.

With regard to the United States, 40 million Americans now need biometric cards for security related reasons, and I think that number will increase over time as well. We did look into the cost of it, and it's very expensive. There's no question.

We looked into a national identification card system and estimated that it would cost \$11

billion to do, but if you link that to a census, which 1 of course is coming up for the year 2010, that costs 2 about \$8 billion. You connect the two and you can do 3 4 it at significantly reduced costs as a result of it, 5 but it would be expensive to do that. 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: How does that work in the absentee ballot context? Is there a biometric 7 8 signature affixed to the ballot itself which is then 9 checked against the voter registration roll? 10 DR. PASTOR: Yes. Most states now when 11 you do register, you register with a signature that 12 can be digitalized, and therefore, when the absentee ballot comes in and there's a signature on that, you . 13 14 can -- at the county level most states do have a machine that can assess that that's the same signature 15 16 as the original one on your registration. 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Have you 18 considered any libertarian objections to having some 19 kind of procedure such as that? It's not fingerprint, but nonetheless, it's something that is 20 21 specific to the person. 22 And also, Mr. Fund had mentioned the 23 conspiratorial nature of new technologies as applied 24 to voting. You can just imagine the conspiracies that 25 may arise when people think that their signatures are

somehow digitalized and might be broadcast to users 1 2 that shouldn't have them. 3 DR. PASTOR: Well, we recommend a series 4 of procedural and institutional safeguards that go 5 back to the basic privacy laws that have had to deal 6 with that, you know, for regular commerce as well, but 7 there is that risk. There's no question about it. 8 The issue for public policy is how do you minimize 9 that risk and how do you introduce safeguards and 10 prohibitions on abuse. 11 MR. FUND: I am very concerned about 12 absentee ballots and their spread. At current trends, 13 we're going to have a nation half of which votes on . 14 election day and half of which votes outside election 15 I question whether that's what the Founding 16 Fathers or even what the rest of us would want. 17 In addition, and I repeat this from my 18 original testimony, if you want to talk about voter 19 intimidation, have somebody have an absentee ballot. 20 They are subject to intimidation from all kinds of 21 people around them, their spouse, their relatives, the 22 local political boss, their employer, their local 23 union official. 24 There were documented cases in

Philadelphia during a very close state senate election

in the 1990s in which poll workers went door to door, political poll workers went door to door in Hispanic neighborhoods saying (speaking Spanish), "This is the new way to vote." They would hand them an absentee ballot, and the person would have to mark it in front of them, and the implication was that various political blandishments and various political favors that were traditionally given out in that neighborhood were not going to be dispensed unless the absentee ballot was filled out there right on the spot in front of a political worker.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Similar allegations were made in Florida, too, with respect to

allegations were made in Florida, too, with respect to that type of intimidation. My day job, which I'm moonlighting right now, is with the National Labor Relations Board, where we try to avoid mail ballot elections for some of the same reasons you mentioned.

And there is also the component of if you've got a mail ballot that is sent in a month before the traditional election day, there's a kind of overarching Madisonian concern about, well, the person hasn't been fully informed about the debate between two candidates or a couple of propositions before he has even cast a ballot. It's a prejudicial vote, in a sense. He's simply making that determination

without being fully informed.

And aside from the cost, I have one kind of macro question, and that is we have been talking in somewhat of an informational vacuum here about possibly voter intimidation, fraud, suppression, but is there a baseline by which we can measure whether or not those things are either increasing or decreasing?

I know it seems that all of these concerns seem to be much more heightened since the 2000 election was so close, but if we take that as the baseline, do you sense that these concerns are increasing? Are they decreasing? Are we on the way to solving some of these things?

MS. BRAZILE: I see it as increasing over the past few years. Look. I've been trying to rally Democrats since at least in the mid-1980s to look at patterns of voter intimidation. As many people of color and others began to register in large numbers, I found problems. Some problems existed because individuals after being registered, they were told they were no longer eligible. Some of it has to do with felony, disenfranchisement, which, you know, unfortunately disproportionately impact minorities and poor people.

Some of it has to do with the fact that

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

when they register to vote, they didn't fill out the form completely, and when they went to actually vote, they were told that they could not.

So I see some of the problems increasing. Clearly, in 2004 with some of the voter intimidation, suppression problems that occurred even weeks before election day, I tried to at the time in 2004 work with Ed Gillespie, work with the Republican party so that we can as party operatives have polling monitors at the polling places in a nonpartisan way, knowing that we were both deploying thousands and thousands of lawyers on election day.

way to deal with these problems and what we're doing at the Democratic National Committee -- I'm sure the Republicans are doing something similar -- is that we're trying to educate people far in advance of election day to, one, check their status, to see, to make sure that they're on the voter registration rolls.

Secondly, if they're experiencing any problems, to call that 1-800 number so that we can try to rectify the problem before election day. On election day itself the majority of the calls that we get to our 1-800 numbers are people who are lost.

Their polling place has changed. They don't know where to go and vote. No one told them they could cast a provisional ballot.

And then, of course, we have had instances where they've arrived and there are no ballots or the machines have malfunctioned or there are some other problems.

So we try to document all of this. We try to turn it into the proper authorities in real time, and then we try to find ways to educate the general population in the future.

MR. HEARNE: I would agree real briefly and note that as we've seen, and, Chairman, you've noted that we've seen increasingly elections decided by very narrow margins, and with that you see particularly in those battleground states increasing efforts of some to game the system one way or another.

Donna made a point, and I think it's one that I certainly share, and that is there is a role for both political parties to exercise responsibility by working to educate their supporters to work together. I know Ed Gillespie in the last election called on Terry McAuliffe to jointly pull out some teams to try to resolve the problems.

These issues, I think, as Donna has

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

identified transcend partisanship because we need at the end of the day, whether it's a Republican or Democrat who won the election, all of the citizens need to be confident that they, the citizens, the voters were the ones who made that decision, not somebody gaming the system.

So that really does transcend partisan interests in my view.

DR. PASTOR: I'm not sure that fraud and intimidation are increasing, but I am sure that the perception is that they are, and that's as significant in the electoral process as the reality, which we're going to always have difficulty ascertaining.

The good news, however, is that that's because people are paying more attention and that they're watching things much more closely in the electoral process since 2000 than they ever have before and that's a positive things because that's compelling this Commission and all of us to work on the full range of problems that we face and hopefully modernize our system because I think the problem with the United States is we were complacent for far too long with our electoral system. We didn't pay attention.

The fact people are paying attention now

1	is a good thing, provided it's a motive for us
2	modernizing the system.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, actually my
5	question was for Mr. Fund as soon as he gets back. So
6	I'll pass for the time being.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, I was hoping
9	Mr. Fund would be here also, but the three remaining
10	panelists could address this.
11	We've had HAVA in place for a few years
12	now. We've got the Electoral Assistance Commission.
13	We've got the example that we wish to avoid of 2000
14	and in 2004 and the concerns about that, Washington
15	State, a lot of things where there have been
16	litigations surrounding elections.
17	We're about a month away from the midterms
18	of 2006. In your opinion and I know this is
19	something difficult of definite ascertainment in
20	your opinion are we better prepared right now for
21	having a cleaning election than we were in the past or
22	do we face some significant problems in the 2006
23	election?
24	MR. HEARNE: I will venture a quick
25	prophecy here, and that is that 2006, in answer to

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

your question, has some tools in place with HAVA, single statewide voter rule, some improved processes, some new technology. It all should help us to have more comfort in our election process.

That said, '06, this midterm election will be the first year in which an immense new system of conducting elections is implemented, whether it's a statewide role or new technology as mentioned. That raises, just the novelty of the way we're running the election in '06 compared to all of these prior years, that raises the greatest likelihood of real problems in the voter rolls particularly, as well as the machines, as people saw in Maryland.

That would be the concern I think we have this year. It isn't that we're not moving in the right direction, but this is our transition year for HAVA in many ways, and that raises some real concerns.

DR. PASTOR: We're not prepared for November 2006, and there will be major problems. Hopefully people will not just vote on the close races, which is what we tend to do. If the election is not close, people just walk away and don't ask the hard questions about whether the system is working.

There are, as Thor pointed out, a few areas where we are a little bit better off. You've

more

and

got a provisional ballot that you didn't have before, 1 for example, but there are a lot of other areas that were a lot worse off because of the expansion of 4 electronic machines and the last of paper verifiable audit trails, the lack of adequate training, 5 6 confusion over the sets of rules, 7 importantly, the fact that we are paying 8 attention. 9 We will find a lot more things wrong than 10 we had found in the past, not necessarily because 11 there are more things wrong, but we're watching for 12 them now. 13 MS. BRAZILE: As I mentioned earlier in my 14 15 16 17 18 fall.

2

3

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony, there's a citizen led campaign to encourage states and localities to have emergency paper ballots on hand for many of these jurisdictions that will be using these new voting systems for the first this That is one of my major concerns, these new voting systems.

We saw it in Maryland. The Washington <u>Post</u> reported the machines had to be rebooted. Many of the access cards didn't show up on time. That created problems. Some of the machines failed to communicate properly with other units.

In Massachusetts just recently in their

1 primary, the scanners did not work. 2 In Ohio there was a report out by the 3 Cuyahoga County Commission that their electronic scanners were useless and delayed results for several 4 hours and almost a week before they had all of the 5 6 reports there. 7 In Illinois, in March they had problems 8 with their new technology cards, the results to be 9 reported four weeks late. El Paso, Texas, I can go on and on. 10 11 The problem with these new voting machines 12 that have problems that can be tampered with, we don't 13 know the source codes for many of them. This is a 14 problem that I think is going to cause a lot of 15 election anxiety this coming November. 16 But by and large, I think the Democratic 17 party, I know, and I know many of the nonpartisan 18 groups out there are trying to educate people. 19 National Association of Secretaries of State are 20 encouraging voters to check to make sure that they're 21 on the voter registration rolls before they show up. 22 And, again, we're calling on people to 23 exercise their right to vote and to request a 24 provisional ballot if they are told that their name is 25 not on the registration rolls.

1 REYNOLDS: CHAIRMAN Okay. Α quick 2 question. We haven't discussed this issue, at least not in depth, but the issue of felons regaining their 3 rights to vote. Would any of the panelists like to 4 5 discuss that issue? 6 MS. BRAZILE: Well, there's no question 7 that there's a disproportionate number. I'm a

that there's a disproportionate number. I'm a southerner, and there was recently a case in Alabama, I believe, where this issue of American citizens who have paid their dues to society, paid their debts back are still disenfranchised. Over a third of African American men in the deep South are ineligible to vote because they lost their voting rights when they had a felony or misdemeanor conviction.

Americans. Again, the Brennan Center for Justice, I like their reports because they're nonpartisan. It doesn't put all of my partisan spin on it, but there's an estimated 5.3 million Americans who are barred from voting because of felony conviction. A disproportionate number of African American and Latino communities are impacted by this, and it's time that we find ways to reenfranchise these citizens.

I know some States like Iowa and Virginia, they're finding ways to have these citizens reapply

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	for their citizenship so that they can once again have
2	a voice in the electoral process.
3	But this is a problem and we should find
4	ways to address it.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Professor Pastor, any
6	comments?
7	DR. PASTOR: Yes. The Carter-Baker
8	Commission also came out clearly in favor of
9	restoration of voting rights for eligible citizens who
10	have been convicted of a felony, though it also
11	singled out the felony would not include a capital
12	crime or one which requires enrollment with an
13	offender registry for sex crimes once they've served
14	their full sentence, including any terms of probation
15	or parol.
16	So, in short, we do believe that
17	restoration of voting rights for people who committed
18	felonies, with the exception of these two elements.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So the report contains
20	two exceptions.
21	DR. PASTOR: That's right.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would it be
23	permissible for states to entertain standards and
24	consider other types of felonies that would bar ex
25	offenders for either a longer period of time or
ï	ł

-	permanencry:
2	DR. PASTOR: Well, the statement that I
3	just mentioned represented a compromise among the
4	Commission members. That was sort of carefully
5	crafted and
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I can imagine the work
7	that went into that.
8	DR. PASTOR: and so I think I'll just
9	let if you're asking about the Commission's
10	recommendation on that, I'll just leave it with that,
11	if I could.
12	MS. BRAZILE: And I will submit for the
13	record the report from the Brennan Center that also
14	show that 80 percent of the American people favor
15	returning voting rights to citizens once they've
16	completed their sentences for felony convictions, and
17	the United States is the only democracy in the world
18	that disenfranchises people who have completed their
19	sentences.
20	So I would like to submit this for the
21	record, sir.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure, sure.
23	Commissioner Kirsanow.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: There was some
25	illusion to the difficult not some. There was a

that

lot of illusion to the difficulties surrounding new 1 2 techniques, new standards for voting, and that that 3 may prompt problems down the road in the future. 4 There are a number of studies 5 indicate that many of the difficulties that we find in 6 balloting, for example, in Florida 2000, was a result 7 of first time voters being unfamiliar with the ballot, 8 and there was a recommendation, I think, made that the 9 parties, for example take it upon themselves to 10 educate voters. 11 But has there ever 12 13 14 fifth grade.

been any recommendations? This seems to me to be Civics 101, something we should be teaching in third, fourth, . If there's a new implementation of the voting procedure, we should be teaching kids, hev, look. We've got a new procedure. Here's how it works, or people in high school who are about to become voters.

Has that been recommended by the Carter-Baker? Because I didn't read the whole report.

MR. HEARNE: There has been a few points I would note. Speaking for myself, I think it is a very good thing for people to take children to polling places, to encourage them, to model voting behavior, and for example, in Missouri we recently amended our

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

state law to expressly allow parents to bring their children to the polling place. That's a good thing. Previously they were prohibited under some state laws.

So states can do some certain things. I know the Carter-Baker Commission -- I can let Bob address that -- there was certainly very much of a desire that we provide education and sufficient resources, particularly with new technology so that everybody gets to use it, particularly those who are technologically challenged, older people who are not as familiar with technology need to know this year these voting systems.

and I think that's incumbent on local election officials to make sure they do. Where they have the ability to go into community centers or nursing homes and provide a demonstration of the technology, and again, as you were mentioning, particularly the new generation of individuals coming along.

One final quick point I would note is in the process, again, particularly with new technology, particularly if you get into recounts, another factor that I have certainly seen and you saw in Florida is the need for a consistent standard for conducting the election, not just running the election, but if you

1 get into any disputed issues, recounts, things of that 2 nature, to have a system in place that does not create opportunity, advertent or inadvertent, for election 3 officials to exercise arbitrary discretion. 4 5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Don't you think that Bush-Gore decision almost mandates that? Maybe 6 in a way that may be somewhat difficult, but --7 I actually read it slightly 8 MR. HEARNE: 9 differently. I read Bush-Gore saying that under the 10 equal protection clause what we need to do is to make 11 sure a state unifies and standardizes their procedures 12 within the state. 13 So in my home State of Missouri, whether 14 I'm voting in St. Louis County or whether I'm voting 15 in Kansas City or Springfield, that those votes of whomever are cast are going to be counted, processed 16 17 the same way, and if there's a recount, that the 18 process for reviewing them is the same. 19 And also that it's not open to just the 20 discretion of the election officials at that time. 21 One final point I can't let go by. Donna, 22 you mentioned the need for paper back-up ballots. 23 fully support that. That is a very important 24 procedure, particularly this year as we get into that 25 technology, to have that kind of fail safe voting in place so we don't disenfranchise any voter.

1.7

DR. PASTOR: There are studies that people are intimidated from voting by electronic machines and by the complexity of the process. They are just almost afraid to come to vote because they don't want to be embarrassed.

And in our electoral system where the rules are so different from county to county and from state to state, we don't have the opportunity that a lot of countries have where they spend a lot of money to show everybody exactly how to vote, you know, what the process is like. And they do it on television for 20 or 30 minutes.

We don't have that luxury when there are so many different machines and so many different standards within counties and whatever else. So to a certain extent if they could have just statewide uniformity and much more civic education on television because that's where people are going to get it, not in the voter guide because a lot of poor people don't read the voter guides.

I think that's absolutely critical to the process. Civic education is key. The Help America Vote Act was the first time that the federal government gave money for civic education to the

# NEAL R. GROSS

states, and the states used it, and there are many studies that suggest that it really did help voter participation because people got a little bit more comfortable in explaining how the process was going to work.

MS. BRAZILE: You know, unfortunately, the burden of election protection, voter education, voter registration is placed on our candidates and our major two-party system. We don't have often third party organizations who are willing to go out there and register voters, to educate them, and then to turn them out to the polls. The system is now such that it's so partisan out there, it's so highly charged many of these that groups either of opt out participating or it's left to some small minister in a church who's still willing to go out there and do what I call the Lord's work and encouraging people to get out and vote.

So until we have a uniform system in place, until we fully properly fund our election personnel, until we fully encourage every citizen to take part in our electoral process, we're going to have problems at the polling place.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner Yaki.

1

2

3

4

.5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much.

One brief statement and then I want to just ask Mr. Fund a question, but we've talked a lot about how this whole aura of electoral issues, whether there are problems, whether it's intimidation, whether it's, fraud, whether it's registration, whatever, undermines confidence in our voting system, and I guess part of me doesn't want you to answer because I really need to ask Mr. Fund this last question, but perhaps after that.

How much, as somebody who has been in politics not as long as Ms. Brazile or as successful as Ms. Brazile, but certainly as someone who has been there and done campaign work at the national and state levels, one of the things you find when you go out and you talk to people is that the level of rhetoric, the way that negative ads have taken over, the way that campaigns are being waged has also had an impact on really how people feel about the electoral system and their willingness to participate in that process, given that it's a question of just who is my least worst choice.

That being said, to Mr. Fund, I just wanted to finish on this one question that I had asked the others regarding the idea of a national voter ID

or ID card or real ID or house ID, whatever you want 1 2 to call it, and the fact that at least amongst the 3 three people before you, if it were to come to pass 4 and it's still not sure if it will, the fact that it 5 must be free and that the predicates to getting it must be free in order to insure accessibility to it, 6 7 I just wonder if you agreed with that as well. 8 MR. FUND: I don't believe that you have 9 to have a system in which all 300 million Americans or 10 all 220 million who are eligible to vote don't have to 11 pay anything for an ID card. I would submit to you 12 that the actual ID card itself should be free. 13 think if you have to provide some documentation and . you have the means to do so, I think a small, modest 14 15 charge would be possible. 16 If you wish to declare that you do not 17 have the resources, I think that would be a very 18 simple procedure of just signing a statement to that effect, no questions asked. 19 20 So I would submit to you free to anyone 21 who feels if they need it to be free or wish it to be free, but I don't believe Ted Turner, I don't believe 22 23 Bill Gates --24 No, I understand. COMMISSIONER YAKI:

MR. FUND:

25

-- I don't believe those

1 people should necessarily be given a free birth 2 certificate. COMMISSIONER YAKI: But at least a minimal 3 means test if someone says I can't give --4 MR. FUND: Absolutely. 5 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- 20 bucks to get my 7 birth certificate or 75 bucks to get my driver's I just can't do it. You would say they 8 9 could get that. 10 MR. FUND: Yes, but I do think that the actual problem has been exaggerated. 11 The vast 12 majority of Americans have some form of photo ID 13 identification, and I think in the vast majority of . 14 cases that can be converted into the ID that meets the 15 security requirements that we're going to have in the 16 next few years. 17 Obviously this has to be phased in. 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I guess my concern is 19 that the vast majority does include some of my 20 majority, or non-majority. 21 MR. FUND: I think provisions have to be 22 made for them, and remember over 100 nations, as 23 Professor Pastor has pointed out, have encountered 24 this problem. Over 100 nations, and I can assure you 25 the vast majority of them have lower per capita

incomes than we do. They somehow have found a way to do that.

believe best practices are here. Professor Pastor is a noted expert on this, and I think that he and his colleagues in academia have probably gone out and done studies or can do studies on how to square having a population that can't afford these documents and yet 100 nations have been able to establish svstems that give the people documents.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I would just kind of go back to the point I made before my question to you, which is that we can talk about how 579 votes, 2,000 votes were found to be whatever. We don't know many non-votes were not cast because of intimidation. We don't know how many votes were turned away because of whatever. We don't know how many votes weren't cast because people just have no faith in the system entirely.

From the candidates, to the parties, to whatever and how we overcome that I think is the greater barrier to full participation, not just whether or not we catch Harry Houdini voting three times in Michigan or someone blocking a roadway and saying, "Sorry. The election was yesterday. It's all

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

canceled."

Beyond that, the bigger problem is how do we get Americans to believe that this is something really worth investing in. I mean I hate to say this. I'm someone who just became a permanent absentee voter because I couldn't stand going to my polls anymore and waiting and watching these folks who admittedly are good, patriotic Americans, but just bumbling up the process with machines and the lines were just getting incredible.

Now, on the other hand, if we were in a situation, as they did in the first election in South Africa, where people were waiting eight hours in the hot sun to vote and they had 99 percent turnout, I'll take that.

MR. FUND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'll take that.

MR. FUND: Well, I want to echo the comments in your statement because we do have a problem. We rank 139th out of 163 democracies in the rate of voter participation. If we continue to see voter participation decline, we're going to have voting left to the zealous or the self-interested few, and the more we have those people vote and other people of goodwill not vote, the more we're going to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

see harshly personal campaigns that dispense with any positive vision of our national future.

And some people would say the current election resembles that.

MS. BRAZILE: I agree on that one. Less than 12 percent of Americans participated this past year in the primary election, and we all know based on previous elections that the average turnout in offseason election mid-term is 37, 38 percent.

So this is a real problem. You know, many
Americans feel overwhelmed as it is, and when they
hear of these new barriers, these new restrictions,
these new regulations, it intimidates certain people,
and we need to be cognizant of that when we put
forward new ideas to improve our democracy.

MR. FUND: I want to echo what my friend Donna said, and that's this. Let's look at what the customers are telling us, first time voters when you turn 18. Only 11 percent of 18 and 19 year olds vote in their first election. They're telling us something. They're telling us that the process isn't meaningful to them or that they no longer feel as if it has anything to do with their daily lives or that they've lost confidence in it because they're just awash in cynicism.

1

### CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This relatively narrow question. A couple of months ago we just reauthorized temporary provisions of probably the most successful piece of civil rights legislation that we've seen, the Voting Rights Act. Commissioner Melendez referred briefly to one of the provision, Section 203. That one is primarily -- not primarily, but in large part -- dealing with bilingual ballots for Native Americans. But there's also the correlative 211 which deals with bilingual ballots that's based on a certain calculation of percentage of perceived bilingual speakers in a particular jurisdiction.

whether or not -- let me back up. During the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee prior to reauthorization of temporary provisions of the Voting Rights Act, there was some concern about the complexity of certain ballot propositions, and when you translate them you don't necessarily get an exact translation from English to, say, Tagalog or English to some other language.

Has there ever been an assessment done as to whether or not that presents a vehicle for either

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 error or fraud that is the bilingual ballot and 2 anything that may be lost in translation? 3 DR. PASTOR: I'm not aware of such a 4 study. 5 Good question. PARTICIPANT: б DR. PASTOR: And I think it's a very good 7 question. I think translating those referendums from legalese into English is a far more difficult problem 8 9 I find, but I don't know the answer to your question. 10 So I don't know whether they've really looked at that 11 closely. 12 As you know, some of the referendum are 13 very convoluted in English. 14 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I have to read 15 them three, four times, actually, the Constitutional 1.6 amendments. 17 DR. PASTOR: So to be able to assure that 18 they are translated properly if we can't understand 19 them, well, is still a large problem. 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I know in one case 21 York, for example. This wasn't about 22 composition. It had to do with two candidates for a 23 particular office, and I can't recall which language 24 the translation was made into. It my have been into 25 Chinese, but I'm not sure, but they transposed the

party affiliations from Republican to Democrat and 1 2 vice versa. You can imagine in New York City the poor 3 Democrat who then became a Republican. You know, he 4 may not be very happy about that. 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki. б 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just wanted to put a little humorous story on that from the great multi-8 9 lingual City of San Francisco that I used to represent 10 with such great joy, but one of the interesting things 11 had to do with how you took someone's name and put it 12 in Chinese characters. 13 And I actually came up with the basic · policy that it would essentially be phonetic because 14 15 Chinese characters all have their own particular 16 pronunciations. And the reason we did that is because 17 a couple of people decided to take great liberties 18 with their names and create whole new Chinese names 19 for themselves. Some of them were resembling ancient 20 Chinese leaders of old history that people would recognize and go, "Oh, this must be the relative of," 21 22 you know, whoever it was. 23 So we had to put a stop tot hat because 24 people were taking great creativities that they can 25 only do in San Francisco.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. On that note, 1 I would like to conclude. 2 May I just 3. DR. PASTOR: I'm sorry. At several points in time I correct one thing? 4 5 referred to these estimates on the real ID law of being as much as \$11 billion, and I said that it was 6 a report by the National Association of Secretaries of 7 State. 8 That's incorrect. 9 I just found it. was from the National Governors Association, 10 11 National Conference of State Legislatures. So I'd 12 just like to correct that part of the record. 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. 14 Well, I would like to thank all of the 15 panelists for their excellent presentations. I think 16 that his has been quite enlightening, and with this era of close elections, this conversation is sorely 17 18 needed, and with any luck we can continue this process 19 that we've started to improve the efficiency of our 20 national and state and local elections. 21 Thank you. 22 (Whereupon, at 3:29 p.m., the meeting and 23 briefing were concluded.) 24

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of: Commission Meeting

Before: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Date: October 13, 2006

Place: 624 Ninth Street, NW

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Eric Hendrixson